

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 06825041 8



B 4th Reg
2 F R M





A
R E P O R T

OF THE

D I S C U S S I O N

HELD IN NEWMARKET, N. H.

B E T W E E N

REV. S. C. BULKLEY, UNIVERSALIST,

A N D

ELIAS HUTCHINS, FREEWILL BAPTIST—

I N C L U D I N G

A R E P L Y T O A L E T T E R

F R O M

M R . B A L F O U R .

"If we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins." Heb. 10:26.

"Perhaps there is no better way of detecting the fallacy of a doctrine, than by looking at the difficulties into which it leads."—*O. A. Skinner's Universalism Illustrated and Defended.*

D O V E R :
P U B L I S H E D B Y E. H U T C H I N S .

William Burr, Printer.

1842.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
364008A

ARTICLES

FILED

R

2.

NOTE. Lest some should suppose that my opponent is not very well qualified to sustain universalism, the testimony of two of his brethren is here adduced to show that he is an able disputant.

Mr. C. C. Burr, universalist minister in Portland, Me., and editor of the Universalist Palladium of that city, in his paper of Aug. 14, 1841, says, 'Elder Hutchins seems to have ransacked all the works against universalism within his reach for objections to our faith. Every objection is fairly met and triumphantly refuted by brother Bulkley, who certainly possesses an eminent degree of talent for a controversy. He deserves a gold medal for the service which he is doing our cause in this way.' Mr. R. O. Williams, formerly pastor of the universalist Society in Dover, in the 'Star of Bethlehem,' Vol. 1, No. 21, asserts, 'Br. Bulkley is very well qualified, both from his familiar acquaintance with the subject, and his experience in theological controversy, to engage in such a discussion.' These witnesses testify that I am 'a stupid blockhead,' a 'most consummate blockhead,' a 'theological minney,' my 'ideas' in the discussion, are 'pointless and crude,' &c. Yet, strange to tell, Mr. B. 'deserves a gold medal for the service which he is doing' universalism by 'triumphantly' *refuting* the *crude ideas* of a consummate blockhead !!!

P R E F A C E.

The following discussion was held on the evenings of the 27th, 28th, 29th and 30th of April, and on those of the 3d, 4th, and 5th of May, 1841. Dr. G. W. Kittredge acted as moderator. The challenge was given by Mr. Bulkley, and the debate was held in his meeting house, which was most of the time crowded to overflowing. The disputants spoke twice every evening, occupying twenty-three minutes each time of speaking.

As universalists at a distance claimed a decided victory for Mr. B. I proposed to unite with him in publishing our arguments. He flatly refused my proposition although I pressed him to accept it. But notwithstanding this refusal, a report of the controversy was written by him or some one else, and published in the Universalist Palladium, printed in Portland, Me. In this report my part of the discussion is garbled, distorted, and mutilated; two of my replies are wholly left out, another is given in five lines, and my main arguments throughout the discussion, are mostly omitted. Before its publication was commenced, Rev. C. C. Burr, an editor of the Palladium, wrote me an offer to publish my own report of the replies to Mr. Bulkley. But the letter containing this offer, contained also a condition which entirely excluded me from the privilege offered! This statement Mr. Burr has attempted to deny publicly; but I have proved it by the testimony of another universalist minister. This evidence he has not attempted to set aside, therefore he stands charged with misrepresentation in denying what I have proved to be true. Numerous misstatements, perversions, and misrepresentations have been published by universalists respecting myself, and matters respecting the discussion. Thirty one of these were exposed in the Morning Star of Sept. 1, 1841. These, however, are not half of what were published in their papers!

Under these circumstances I feel called upon to give the public my own report of my arguments, with those of my opponent as he has given them to the community, through the Palladium.

My course in the debate, is, I think, a new method of dealing with universalists. If it is thought that my replies contain more than Mr. Bulkley's arguments required, I would say that my design in this, was to show that universalism is no better sustained by his proof texts than it was by his reasoning. I also wished to make it manifest that this dogma unavoidably tends to the doctrine of no future existence. How far I succeeded, others must decide.

Earnestly desiring that the doctrine of Christ may prevail, and ruinous errors cease, the writer commends his humble effort to the favor of God, and the candid consideration of those who wish to know the truth.

ELIAS HUTCHINS.

New Market, N. H.

THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION.

QUESTION—DO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES TEACH THE DOCTRINE OF THE FINAL HOLINESS AND HAPPINESS OF ALL MEN?

FIRST EVENING.

The debate was led throughout by Rev. Mr. Bulkley, who commenced the affirmative as follows:

It will scarcely be necessary for me to inform this numerous and respectable audience that the question before us is one of great importance. We live in a world where death reigns with arbitrary and universal sway. We see our friends one after another falling and dying around us, and the events and occurrences of almost every day of our lives, show that we, too, soon must follow them. The question before us, if rightly viewed, is but an inquiry into the fate of the departed. No other consideration surely can be needed to awaken in us the most lively interest, and to show that it as far transcends in interest and importance all other questions as the imperishable joys and realities of eternity exceed the fleeting vanities of time. I am encouraged in the attempt to sustain the affirmative of this question by the reflection that the best wishes and prayers of the whole Christian world are enlisted on my side. For whatever may be believed concerning this matter, I am certain that there is not a good man nor a Christian in the world who does not ardently desire and pray for the final holiness and happiness of all men. Let us now attend to the question, with all that seriousness and solemnity of mind which these considerations are so well calculated to inspire.

The holy Scriptures do teach the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all men, in as much as this is a legitimate inference from the perfections of God, as therein revealed. See Mat. 5:44—48. “But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, and do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you ; that you may be the children of your Father which is in heaven : for he maketh his sun to shine on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? and if ye salute your brethren only, what do you more *than others*?

do not even the publicans so? Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." Now as God loves his friends, if He loves his enemies, He of course loves all mankind, inasmuch as all are included under one or the other of these characters. That he does love his enemies, and will do them good, is a necessary inference from the fact that he has commanded us to love our enemies and do them good, that we may be his children, i. e. characteristically such; and that we may be perfect as He is perfect. But we do not rest this conclusion upon inference merely, for there are abundant direct and explicit testimonies touching this point, to be found in the holy scriptures. See 1st John 4:10—Eph. 2:4, 5—Rom. 5:8. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son *to be* the propitiation of our sins." "But God who is rich in mercy, for this great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved.)" "But God commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Now these passages show in as plain terms as any language that could be employed, that the love of God towards His creatures is wholly independent of their affections or conduct towards Him. The fact, then, may be regarded as established upon the highest authority, that God loves all mankind, even His enemies. And since God is an unchangeable Being, (see James 1:17,) if he loves them now, or if He ever loved them, we conclude that he will eternally love them. We are strengthened in this conclusion by the consideration that if our want of love to God, our sinfulness, and our enmity to Him has not, as the above texts testify, alienated his affections from our race, then it is safe to conclude that nothing can produce such a result. If it be true, then, that God loves all men, without any exception, and if it be true, also, that nothing which is past, present, or to come, can separate them from that love, all of which, as we have seen, the holy scriptures do teach, what are we to conclude will be the result as it respects the final condition of our race? Paul informs us, (Rom. 13:10,) that "Love worketh no ill." The immutable love of God cannot, therefore, annihilate any of its objects, for we know and feel that annihilation would be a dreadful evil—the greatest, with one exception, that can be imagined. It is contrary to all past conceptions of the divine nature, to suppose that it can annihilate any of its objects; for love, be it remembered, is a conservative principle—it seeks not to destroy, but to preserve. In the beginning, it gave birth to existence, and is ever active in preserving and sustaining it. If, then, as must be entirely obvious to every reflecting mind, annihilation is an evil of such dreadful magnitude as to render it inconsistent with the immutable love of God, how much more so is endless misery, which all must

allow is an inconceivably greater evil. That endless misery is an evil greater than the utmost ingenuity of men or devils could invent, will not be denied. It is impossible, therefore, in the nature of things, to reconcile its infliction with that love which worketh no ill. The final holiness and happiness of all men is, in fact, the only inference that can rationally be drawn from the immutable love of God towards them. Of this we may be assured by considering the operations of that divine principle as it is faintly and imperfectly exhibited in the operations of the human heart. The love which is exhibited in our domestic and social intercourse, and which we exercise towards each other, as kindred, neighbors, and friends, is but an emanation from that eternal principle which created, sustains, and controls the universe. Now let me inquire, would you not render the dear objects of your love holy and happy? Would you not cleanse, sanctify and save even the vilest of our race? I will not wait for an answer to these questions, for we have it in the untiring efforts, prayers, and desires of every Christian denomination for the salvation of the world. The religious enterprises of the day show plainly that all good men and Christians, of every denomination, would make all men holy and happy if they could. But can they rationally pretend that they love their fellow men more than God, or that they would do better by them than He does? As well might it be pretended that a drop exceeds its fountain, or that a mere spark exceeds the central sun of the universe. But perhaps I shall be told that such comparisons are improper and irreverent. If so, the fault is not ours, but the fault of the inspired writers themselves, as may be easily shown. I will name a few of the many passages that might be cited to prove this point. See Chron. 21:13—Isaiah 49:15—also Matt. 7:11. "If ye, then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?" This last named passage is worthy of particular observation. It would be no violence to the sentiment contained in the passage, to say, "If ye then, being evil, would render all men holy and happy, how much more shall our Father which is in heaven?" The scriptures do, indeed, declare that as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are the ways of God higher than our ways; but we have yet to learn that he is so much worse. If God is infinitely greater, we may safely conclude that He is infinitely better than we. Let it be shown then, if by any means it can be made to appear, how the impartial and immutable love of God can result in any thing else but the final holiness and happiness of all men.

Mr. Hutchins' Reply :

The question now to be discussed is stated in the most guarded manner. It is not, Do the holy Scriptures teach

that all mankind will endlessly dwell in heaven? This would not answer on this occasion; for the *same kind* of arguments which are constantly used to prove that there is no future hell, would prove that there is no future heaven for any of the human race. The words in the Bible rendered heaven in our translation, do not *originally* refer to any thing at all hereafter, any more than the words rendered hell do. Mr. Skinner, a distinguished universalist writer, in his discussion with Mr. A. Campbell, p. 104, says, "neither the Hebrew *Shemim*, the Greek *Ouranos*, nor Persian *Paradiseous*, nor, I may add, the Latin *Caenum*, nor English *Heaven*, is ever relied on by any universalist, nor any other enlightened Christian, as proof of the *endless happiness of the saints.*" David while in this life, got into the lowest hell, or Hebrew *Sheol*, and was delivered from it. Psa. 86:13: Paul was likewise caught up into heaven or paradise and returned again. 2 Cor. 12:2, 4. So it would seem that neither heaven or hell is any thing that is to concern us hereafter. Alexander Campbell, one of the greatest polemical theologians in the United States, in his discussion with Mr. Skinner, says, p. 74, 'Mr. Balfour has in one volume given 254 pages on Gehenna. I can take his own logic and criticism, and in half the number prove there is no heaven.'

His meaning is that with half of Mr. Balfour's arguments in proof of no future hell, he can prove there is no future heaven. And I fearlessly assert that the same kind of arguments which are used to prove there is no future hell, will prove there is no future heaven.

Nor is the question, Do the Holy Scriptures teach the doctrine of the eternal salvation of all men? This would not do ~~nicer~~; for the term 'eternal salvation' is found but once in the Bible, and there it is conditional. 'He became the author of eternal salvation, unto all them that obey him.' Heb. 5:9. Added to this, the phrase 'eternal damnation' occurs once in the Scriptures. Mark 3:29. Hence if the future reference and endless duration of the first of these texts is admitted, it will not be an easy matter to prove that the last refers to events in this life, or is limited in its duration. Yet my opponent will probably quote texts which speak of salvation to prove the final holiness and happiness of all men, notwithstanding the future endless salvation of the human race, is not named in the Bible. If the Scriptures do teach the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all men, it is hoped that the evidences of this doctrine will be presented so clearly that all may be convinced of its truth. And that this will be attempted, I infer from the fact that I have been challenged to this discussion. The affirmative of the question is, All men will finally be made holy and happy. But the phrase final holiness and happiness of all men, is not in the Bible; and whether the Scriptures teach a doctrine which they do

not name, the sequel of this discussion will show. But if this doctrine can be proved from the sacred Oracles, notwithstanding they do not mention it, why may not any doctrine be proved in the same way? Can you suppose, my hearers, that the eternal holiness and happiness of all men can be proved from the Bible, while the doctrine of 'eternal damnation' and 'eternal judgment,' expressly named by the sacred writers, cannot be proved from that Holy Book? I will now show you what Mr. Balfour thinks about doctrines that 'are not found in the Bible.' "An *eternal hell* is often heard of, from the pulpit, and perhaps many believe it to be a Scripture expression. 'This, with many other terrific expressions, which are the chief ornament of many modern sermons, and often uttered without much feeling by the preacher, are not found in the Bible. They are bugbears of his own creating, which no man who regards the Scriptures, and has considered this subject, will be frightened at.'" First inquiry, p. 218. Did "Christ or his apostles" "paint, in glowing colors, the horrors of the damned in hell, to make men Christians?" No man will say so. Not a word was said by them about an eternal hell to the people. All such language is coined at the mint of modern divinity, and may be a very good plan for increasing a sect, but this is a very different thing from making men Christians." p. 219. This is the language of one of the greatest universalist writers in this country. Now leave out of these quotations the phrase 'eternal hell,' with two or three other words, and substitute the question before us, and they stand in their full force against universalism. The *final holiness and happiness of all men*, is often heard of from the pulpit, and perhaps many believe it to be a Scripture expression. This, with many other animating expressions, which are the chief ornaments of many modern sermons, and often uttered without much feeling by the preacher, are not found in the Bible. They are chimeras of his own creating, which no man who regards the Scriptures, and has considered the subject, will be rejoiced at. According to this reasoning, the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all men, is a mere creation of the fancy of ignorant or designing men! But Mr. Balfour's arguments are just as much against an eternal heaven as they are against an 'eternal hell.' Did Christ and the apostles paint in glowing colors, the joys of all mankind in heaven to make men Christians? No man will say so. Not a word was said by them about an eternal heaven to the people. All such language is coined at the mint of modern divinity, and may be a very good plan for increasing a sect, but this is a very different thing from making men Christians? It is seen in the light of this reasoning that we must look upon the doctrine of an eternal heaven, just as universalists do upon that of an eternal hell. Hence, on the authority of Mr. Balfour's reasoning, the question is decided in the negative,

there is no eternal heaven for us, and we may all go home, resting in 'the glorious hope' of no future existence! But if the discussion must proceed, 'I have a right to demand' of my opponent, the SAME KIND of evidence of the final holiness and happiness of all men, that universalists demand in proof of the opposite doctrine. This demand, will, I trust, be remembered, and the audience will wait to see how he will overthrow Mr. Balfour's arguments. I will now reply to the arguments which have been brought forward in support of the affirmative of the question under discussion. I trust that I am not insensible of the 'great importance' of this question; but it is not to be decided by 'an inquiry into the state of the dead,' nor by the ardent desires and 'prayers of the whole Christian world.' The audience have no doubt observed, that my opponent's arguments on the perfections of God, consist altogether of inferences and assumptions. He has quoted Matt. 5:44, 48. But this text does not mention the final holiness and happiness of all men; nor yet does one of the other texts which he has brought forward, name that doctrine! God does his enemies good by causing 'His sun to rise on' them, and by sending them 'rain.' But he does not love them enough to give them a crop by means of the rain and sunshine, whether they labor or are idle. And to assume that God loves His enemies so well that He will save them hereafter, however they may live and die, is taking unwarrantable liberty with His word. Do the rain and sunshine secure 'all men' against death by famine? Most certainly not. Cases of individual starvation occur in various parts of the earth. Farther: What dreadful famines have sometimes devastated large portions of the globe. Only a few years ago a famine in India swept away its thousands. The inhabitants of Agra were compelled to give up their evening drives, on account of the intolerable effluvia arising from the dead bodies surrounding that station. A small river near Cownpore was said to be choked with the corpses of the multitudes starved to death. Hence I conclude, that, as God's love to mankind, as it is manifest in the gifts of rain and sunshine, does not prevent the starvation of 'all men,' it cannot be proved that this love will make them all holy and happy hereafter. Jehovah says, For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater, so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereunto I sent it. Isa. 55:10, 11. From this passage we learn that God accomplishes his purposes in relation to the moral state of man in the same manner that He accomplishes them in regard to supplying his physical wants. Hence, as the use of the rain,

&c. is to fertilize the earth so that it may repay the toil of the laborer with the means of subsistence, it follows that God by his word or gospel, only devises the means by which those who repent and serve Him shall be made holy and happy. Let us suppose that, in the spring, while the rains were descending in copious fertilizing showers, a negligent farmer should say to his family, see what a prospect of a rich harvest we have! what would be thought of his expectations? All would pronounce his confidence in God's love and mercy, an insult rather than an honor to the Father of mercies. Can you believe for a moment, my hearers, that such a man's field would look like one which had been planted and properly cultivated? NO: Yet who would say that God was partial in his love, because one farm was covered with nothing but weeds, while the other was gladdening the heart of its industrious owner with the cheering prospect of a good harvest? Surely no one. Thus it is seen that, in order to be benefitted by the rain and sunshine, man must *labor*. Therefore God's love to all men as it is manifested in these gifts, furnishes no evidence whatever of the unconditional holiness and happiness of all men. Consequently my opponent was unfortunate in selecting a text referring to blessings which God bestows *conditionally* by means of the rain and sunshine, to prove his *unconditional*, universal salvation.

I admit that God loves his enemies and will do them good; but He loves them as much now as He ever will. Hence, as He does not save them now, His love is no proof that he will make all men holy and happy in the immortal state. He has as much power now as He ever will have, and He is as merciful to sinners as He ever will be. Consequently as multitudes are not saved from sin and misery here, it cannot be shown from His perfections, that He will become any more impartial hereafter than He is now. Where then is the assurance of the final holiness and happiness of all men? It is not denied that 'God loves his creatures,' even 'His enemies,' in a certain sense, 'wholly independent of their affection for him.' But this no more proves their future than it does their present holiness and happiness. Hence my opponent's reasoning on this fact is illogical; nor do the irrelevant texts which he has quoted, nor yet the inferences and assumptions he has drawn from them, strengthen his cause. For 'since God is an unchangeable being, (see James 1:17,) if those whom he loves now are sinful and miserable, 'I conclude,' according to my opponent's reasoning, that He will permit them to be miserable and sinful 'eternally.' Rom. 12:10, 'Love worketh no ill,' says nothing about the subject in debate, and therefore it is not to the point. Does this love, which, contrary to the scope of the apostle, has just been applied to God, work the numerous sins and miseries of this

life? If it does, it follows from God's unchangeableness, admitting the correctness of my opponent's reasoning, that these ills will exist *eternally*. And if it does not work them, how can we know that they will cease hereafter? 'Let me inquire, would you not render the dear objects of your love holy and happy' now? 'Would you not cleanse, sanctify and save even the vilest of our race' this moment? 'I will not wait for an answer to these questions, for we have it in the untiring efforts, prayers, and desires of every Christian denomination for the present 'salvation of the world. The religious enterprises of the day show plainly that all good men and Christians, of every denomination, would make all men holy and happy' now 'if they could.' But can my opponent, rationally pretend that they love their fellow men more than God, or that they would do better by them than he does? As well might it be pretended that a drop exceeds its fountain, or that a mere spark exceeds the central sun of the universe.' I would most certainly make sinners holy and happy now, if I could; hence, if my opponent reasons correctly, I have more love for them than God has. A text has been quoted from Isaiah to prove that the love of God is greater than human love. I will 'not forget THEE,' [Zion] says Jehovah; but my opponent would make him say, I will make all men holy and happy hereafter! Before Mat. 7:10, will afford his cause any support, he must *prove* that those who die in sin and unbelief, will ask for mercy and receive salvation beyond the grave. According to his assumptions, "It would be no violence to the sentiment contained in the passage, to say, 'If ye then, being evil, would render all men holy and happy' now, 'how much more shall our Father which is in heaven' " save them all now? It is not for me to show that 'the impartial and immutable love of God' will not result in 'the final holiness and happiness of all men.' But it belongs to my opponent to show, 'if by any means it can be made to appear,' that an *unchangeable* and **IMPARTIAL** God will make those holy and happy hereafter, whom he permits to live and die in an unholy and unhappy state.

REJOINDER. Mr. Bulkley rejoined as follows:

My brother H. evidently misapprehends Mr. Balfour's language. Taken in their proper connection, his words express not merely that the words "endless punishment," but nothing equivalent to that expression, is to be found there. It would be altogether absurd, my friends, as you will at once perceive, to take a question in the very language of Scripture, and then enter into a debate whether such words are found there. It is sufficient therefore to make out my case, to produce such expressions from the Scriptures as are equivalent to the phrase, i. e. mean the same thing as the final holiness and happiness of all men. When I do this, my work is done, in the estimation of all intelligent minds. **The**

question before us, is not what Mr. Balfour teaches? or what do universalist authors teach? but what do the holy Scriptures teach? The remarks on that score are, therefore, out of place, and evidently have nothing to do with the question at issue between us. In my first address, I pointed you to the perfections of God, in proof of the affirmative of the question. And how has that argument been met? Why, my brother had much to say about the rain and sunshine and other matters which are entirely foreign to the point at issue between us. He admitted, indeed, that God loves his enemies and will do them good; but contended that God loves them as much now as He ever will love them—that He does not save them now, and consequently his loving them is no evidence that he will ever save them. But does my brother mean to be understood by this, that God will never do any thing in relation to the salvation of his creatures, but what he has already done? Such, at least, appears to be the spirit and import of his objection. And if what is asserted in this objection be true, it is as fatal to his system as to mine—in short, it is fatal to every christian system; for the plan of divine grace even on partialist principles is not yet fully consummated, and consequently, according to this objection, there is no evidence that it ever will be. I admit that God loves men now as well as he ever will love them, for there is no need that he should love them any better in order to complete the glorious plan of grace which his love has begun in Christ the Savior of the world. So Paul evidently viewed the matter, when he declared (1st Tim. 2:6) that Christ “gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.” Nor did the fact that it was not testified now, detract in the least from the apostle’s faith. Nor should it hinder us from resting in the same glorious assurance. In due time the event will meet its accomplishment, agreeable to what is said by the prophet. (See Isa. li. 2.) For all that has been said, therefore, the final holiness and happiness of all men is a legitimate inference from the perfections of God. My brother has admitted that God loves his enemies and will do them good. Let him then come to the point at once, and show if he can how this love can be reconciled with any thing else but their final holiness and happiness.

Mr. H. replied:—

I ‘evidently’ did not ‘misapprehend Mr. Balfour’s language;’ for I quoted it as he penned it, and it says nothing about something ‘equivalent’ to ‘an eternal hell.’ Nor have I intimated that it would be proper ‘to take a question in the very language of Scripture, and then enter into a debate whether such words are to be found there.’ Nor yet have I intimated that Mr. Balfour’s language implies any such thing. I simply replied to my opponent’s reasoning by arguments based on Mr. Balfour’s method of proving that there is no

eternal hell. Hence the first part of my opponent's last reply is 'out of place,' and uncalled for. If he can 'make out' his 'case' by producing texts which do not mention the final holiness and happiness of all men, what shall we think of Mr. Balfour's argument against an eternal hell when the terms 'eternal damnation' and 'eternal judgment,' are in the Scriptures? According to the argument I am considering, 'in the estimation of all intelligent minds,' although the phrase eternal hell is 'not found in the Bible,' I have shown that all men will not be saved, for I have produced 'such expressions from the Scriptures as are equivalent to the phrase.' I know very well that 'the question before us, is not what Mr. Balfour teaches? or what do universalist authors teach?' But I know also that, in discussing the opposite of this question, universalists are constantly quoting the opinions of Whitby, Doddridge, Lightfoot, Clarke, and many others, to prove their doctrine. And if they have a right to bring in the opinions of such men while discussing scriptural questions, I have a right to adopt a similar method in this discussion. My 'remarks on' this 'score' are therefore not 'out of place.' You have been told that my arguments on 'the rain and sunshine,' subjects distinctly named, and occupying a prominent place in one of my opponent's proof texts, 'are entirely foreign to the point at issue between us.' But as he did not attempt to show the irrelevancy or the fallacy of my reasoning, it is presumed he considered that making this bare assertion was the best way to dispose of arguments which he could not refute. As my remarks were based on a text which treats directly of God's 'perfections'—a text quoted too in support of the affirmative of the question before us,—in dismissing my arguments as foreign to the subject in debate, he has dismissed the text on which they were founded as foreign to his purpose.

It has been asserted that my reasoning on the perfections of God 'is as fatal to' my 'system as to' my opponent's. Let us see if this is true. His system teaches that salvation in the immortal state is *unconditional*, but mine considers it conditional. 'Now, they do it to OBTAIN a corruptible crown; but we an INCORRUPTIBLE:' 1 Cor. 9:25. 'I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto ALL them also that LOVE his appearing:' 2 Tim. 4:7,8. 'He became the author of eternal salvation, unto all them that OBEY him:' Heb. 5:9. 'Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life:' Rev. 2:10. 'To him that overcometh, will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in His throne:' Rev. 3:21.

These texts prove the conditionality of future salvation,

as plainly as any doctrine can be proved by the same number of passages of Scripture.

Hence my argument, which I based upon his own reasoning upon the unchangeableness of God, is not fatal to my system. He admits 'that God loves men now as well as he ever will love them.' To make out his case consistently with this admission, he must show why God does not make all men holy and happy in this state, *unconditionally*. That Christ gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time, is admitted. It is also admitted that the event predicted by the apostle, will be accomplished. The *fact* that Christ died for all, will no doubt be testified in due time. But that this due TIME refers to the immortal state, or that all men will there be made holy and happy, as my opponent seems to infer, is not named by the apostle. And this I think he would have done, had he been a universalist, and intended to 'teach the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all men.' I will here inquire why texts which are silent respecting a future state are used to prove a doctrine which relates to the state of all mankind hereafter? Those who are acquainted with the arguments of universalists against the future reference of texts relating to punishment, will feel the force of this inquiry. I shall wait to see how it will be disposed of. It is true I have admitted that God loves his enemies and will do them good. But while my arguments on the rain and sunshine, showing that he does not love them enough to save them unconditionally either here or hereafter, remains unanswered, this admission neither embarrasses me nor helps my opponent. Nor is it for me to show what 'this love' cannot 'be reconciled with;' but he must show that it will unconditionally effect the final salvation of those who die in unbelief and rebellion against the laws of God. On arriving at home this evening, my hearers, some of your friends will inquire about the discussion. Tell them that not a text has been quoted which mentions the final holiness and happiness of all men. Hence according to Mr. Balfour's reasoning against an eternal hell, universalism will do very well to build up a sect; but this is a different thing from making them Christians.

SECOND EVENING.

Mr. B. continued the argument in the affirmative as follows:—

The holy Scriptures do teach the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all men, inasmuch as they teach that all shall ultimately unite in offering spiritual and divine worship. In attempting to establish this position, I feel that I cannot do better than to avail myself of the remarks of the distinguished orthodox professor Stuart on the passage in Philip. 2:10, 11—"That at the name of Jesus every knee

shall bow, of things in heaven and things in earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

"Things in heaven, earth, and under the earth, is a common periphrasis of the Hebrew and New Testament writers for the universe; (ta pan, or ta panta.) What can be meant by things in heaven, i. e. beings in heaven, bowing the knee to Jesus, if spiritual worship be not meant? What other worship can heaven render? And if the worship of Christ in heaven be spiritual, should not that of others who ought to be in temper united with them, be spiritual too? Rev. 5: 8—14, 'And when he (i. e. Christ, see ver. 6, 7,) took the book, the four beasts and the four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of saints. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book and open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests; and we shall reign on the earth. And I beheld and heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and such as are in the sea and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb forever and ever. And the four beasts said Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped Him that liveth forever and ever.' If this be not *spiritual* worship—and if Christ be not the object of it here; I am unable to produce a case where worship can be called spiritual and divine."—*Stuart's Letters to Channing*, pp. 100—103.

If, then, Professor Stuart is correct in his view of this passage—(and who can show the contrary?)—if all the intelligences in the universe are included in the texts, and if all are ultimately to unite in offering spiritual and divine worship, what further need have we of proof that all shall ultimately be holy and happy? Will it be pretended that any but holy and happy beings can render such worship? We think not: for if there is in the unseen world a gloomy prison house of woe, worship must be a stranger in that dismal abode. There, no hope of present or future good awakens the feelings of devotion. Prayers are unavailing—love is banished from the place—gratitude is swallowed up in the blackness of darkness. No day-star, promising future and lasting good, arises there—no beams of the sun of righteousness gild that gloomy

dungeon: but raging waves of fire, tempestuous wrath, loud thundering peals of eternal vengeance, brood around the soul that is forsaken of its God, and doomed to blaspheme his name forever. Tell us not, then, as you value reason and consistency, that spiritual and divine worship can proceed from spirits black as the shades of eternal night, and whose vocabulary affords only the language of cursing and blasphemy. If, then, holiness be indispensable to the offering of such worship, we may be assured that happiness will be a necessary result; for holiness and happiness are, by the immutable law of God, inseparably connected.

Reply of Mr. H:—

Last evening we were told that the question before us, is not what Mr. Balfour teaches? or what do universalist authors teach? &c. I then suspected that my opponent would soon condemn himself by quoting authors on my side of the question; and this he has done in his quotation from professor Stuart. I will in return inform him that the question before us, is not what professor Stuart teaches? or what orthodox authors teach? but what do the holy Scriptures teach? That the distinguished professor in question, understood his own language better than my opponent understands it, all will admit; and that he did not teach universalism in that quotation, all his able writings against that doctrine, bear ample testimony. Therefore the remarks from his pen are not to the point. When it is proved that the acts of *bowing* and *confessing*, refered to in Phil. 2:10, 11, are to be voluntarily and willingly performed by every member of the human family, the text will prove the final holiness and happiness of all men; but this remains to be done. That all will confess that Christ is Lord, and thus own his authority as governor of the universe, I admit; and that his greatest enemies will have to submit to him in some sense, is also evident, ‘for he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet.’ But that they will all be made holy and happy, is mere assumption and assertion. That Rev. 5:13, has no bearing on the question under discussion, the following considerations will show.

1. At the time when this universal homage was rendered, ‘the earth’ and ‘the sea’ were in existence.
2. Beasts, fishes, and animals of all kinds, are represented as taking part in this universal song of praise. ‘Every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that ARE in them,’ [not all that WERE in them] were heard by John as engaged in rendering the homage spoken of in this verse. This shows that, by a figure of speech called personification, all creation, consisting of things animate and inanimate, was engaged in this worship. David calls upon all parts of creation to praise God in the same manner. ‘Praise the Lord from the earth, ye dragons, and all deeps: fire and hail; snow and vapor; stormy wind

fulfilling his word: mountains, and all hills; fruitful trees, and all cedars: beasts, and all cattle; creeping things, and flying fowl; kings of the earth, and all people; princes, and all judges of the earth; both young men, and maidens; old men, and children; Let them praise the name of the Lord.' Ps. 148: 7—13. 3. The song of praise mentioned in Rev. 5:13, was offered to Christ when he took the sealed book out of the hand of him that sat upon the throne, and *before* the seals were opened. See verses 7, 8. 4. After this song was sung, events transpired, as we learn by the following chapters, which belong to time, and consequently to this earth. See chapter vi. verses 8, 15—17. Also chapter xx. verses 12—14. Here we learn that *after* the song mentioned in Rev. 5: 13, there was sin and misery. Hence my opponent's argument drawn from this text, is illogical and irrelevant, for it is evident the passage does not prove the final holiness and happiness of all men, because beyond the scene which it contemplates, wretchedness and wo are said to exist. 5. Mr. Abel C. Thomas, a 'distinguished' universalist *theological* writer, in his discussion with Dr. Ely, p. 38, says, 'Nor indeed do I see the propriety of urging so confessedly hyperbolical a book as the Apocalypse in proof of any important doctrine.' Again he states, p. 126, 'I may remark, that I profess little acquaintance with the hyperbolical instructions of the Apocalypse. Commentators of every sect have acknowledged their ignorance as to the meaning of many portions of the book; and neither of us would lose any thing, in the estimation of judicious persons, were we to unite in a similar acknowledgement.' Again he remarks, pp. 127—8, "In the first verse of the Apocalypse it is written, 'The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him to show to his servants things which must SHORTLY COME TO PASS.'"

'If, then, Mr. Thomas is correct in his views of the book of Revelation, if it is not proper to urge this book in proof of any important doctrine, if it is judicious to acknowledge our ignorance of the meaning of many portions of it, and if the events there named were SHORTLY to come to pass when the book was written, what proof does it contain that all mankind will ultimately be made holy and happy?

I have never said, nor do I believe, that 'raging waves of fire, tempestuous wrath, and loud thundering peals of eternal vengeance, brood around the soul that is forsaken of its God' in 'the unseen world.' Why, then, does my opponent bring this representation into this discussion? Does he find it necessary to caricature and misrepresent my views in order to prove his own? Such a course is certainly uncalled for if the Bible plainly teaches universalism, and he is able to present its instructions. I most certainly believe in a future state or condition expressed by such phrases as, 'eternal damnation; 'the fire that shall never be quenched: where their

worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched; 'eternal judgment,' 'the lake of fire,' &c. But as these expressions cannot be *literally* true, even in the universalist sense of the meaning of such terms, they are, I conceive, figurative representations of the future condition of those who 'shall not inherit the kingdom of God.'

REJOINDER. Mr B. rejoined:—

Perhaps my brother is right in saying that the construction given of the passages in Philip. and Rev. includes "toads, serpents," &c. Before we admit his assertion, however, let us try his criticism upon another passage, found in Mark, 16: 15—"Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." "Every creature," Br. H. says, includes beasts, toads and serpents. Then the Apostles were commanded to preach to toads and serpents. I must not forget that brother H. claims to act under this commission. May I be permitted to ask him when he last preached to a congregation of toads and serpents, and what is the prospect of a revival among them? As to the assertion that there is to be sin and misery subsequent to the event spoken of in these passages, it rests wholly upon the circumstance that it is named in a chapter that happens to be further along in the book. To illustrate the absurdity of this argument, I need only refer to the fact that, whereas some things spoken of in the book of Genesis are not yet fully consummated, many things spoken of in Revelation were fulfilled centuries ago. The simple fact, therefore, that certain words are found in a certain book or chapter arranged subsequently to others, is no proof that they refer to a later event; this argument, therefore, if such it can be called, amounts to nothing. As to the proof that those passages refer to a future state, I observe, 1. That the worship spoken of is such only as heaven can render; and, 2. There is no evidence that such an event ever did, or ever will occur, in time, or on the earth. A future reference of the texts, therefore, seems indispensable to their integrity; inasmuch as many millions of the intelligences there referred to have passed from the shores of time, and consequently must render that worship in the final state, if at all. Let my brother then prove, if he can, that all intelligences in the universe will unite in offering spiritual and divine worship, short of the final state.

REPLICATION OF MR. H.:—

In answer to the last arguments of my opponent, I would observe, that the remarks on toads and serpents, as I did not use such terms, are as much out of place as they are out of character. It is true I stated that beasts, fishes, and animals of all kinds, were, in a certain sense, engaged in the song mentioned in Rev. 5:13, and I proved my statement by quoting part of that verse; and also part of the one hundred forty eighth Psalm. That the phrase 'every creature,'

means the same in Mark 16:15, that it does in Rev. 5:13, is mere assumption. Hence his attempt to make my reasoning imply that 'the Apostles were commanded to preach to toads and serpents,' is as ungentlemanly as it is irrelevant. His sneering question when I 'last preached to a congregation of toads and serpents, and what is the prospect of a revival among them?' is of the same character. And if he will read my quotation from David's pen, he will see that 'the sweet singer of Israel' is as obnoxious to the charge of *preaching* to the 'dragons,' 'winds,' 'hills,' 'mountains,' 'trees,' &c., as I am to that of preaching to reptiles.' My argument, showing that there is to be sin and misery subsequent to the events spoken of in Phil. 2:11, and Rev. 5:13, is based on Mr. A. C. Thomas' reasoning on the judgment mentioned in the twentieth chapter of Revelation. In his discussion with Dr. Ely, he says, p. 177, "you overlook the fact, that after the judgment spoken of in chapter xx., John 'saw the great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God,' which language forbids your supposition, that after said judgment, the saints were to ascend up to heaven to God." Other universalists have used the same kind of arguments to prove that the great day of wrath, mentioned in Rev. 6:17, belongs to this state. Yet when I use a *similar* argument against the future reference of universalist proof texts, my opponent pronounces it an 'absurdity.' Whether he means that this reasoning is absurd in my hands, while it is conclusive in the hands of universalists, he has not said. He now attempts to prove the future reference of the texts in question by asserting, '1. That the worship spoken of is such only as heaven can render.' To this I reply that John heard it rendered by every creature *on* the earth, *under* it, in the sea, 'and all that' were '*in them*,' as well as in heaven. What now becomes of the assertion that heaven only can render this worship? But he asserts, '2. There is no evidence that such an event ever did, or ever will occur, in time, or on the earth.' Here again he contradicts John, for he heard this song sung by those who were 'in heaven,' and those who were 'on the earth,' 'in the sea,' &c. Consequently when it was sung some were engaged in singing it 'in time.' Although my opponent passed over the most of my arguments against the future reference of Rev. 5:13, and notwithstanding he did not notice my remarks which showed that his inference from Phil. 2:11, is nothing more than assumption or assertion, he now calls on me to 'prove that all intelligences in the universe will unite in offering spiritual and divine worship, short of the final state.' Notwithstanding this work did not belong to me, I have performed it by showing that the worship mentioned by John, whether it was spiritual and divine or not, was offered *before* the seals were broken, and the book, which the Lamb took, was open-

ed—that it was offered by some who were in heaven, some who were on the earth, and some who were in the sea. I now call upon him to ‘prove, if he can, that all intelligences in the universe will unite in offering spiritual and divine worship’ in ‘the final state.’

You may tell your friends to night as you did last night, my hearers, that not a text has been quoted which names the final holiness and happiness of all men. Hence according to Mr. Balfour’s reasoning, we have additional evidence that this doctrine, however it may serve to build up a sect, does not make men Christians. When one text is quoted that mentions the future salvation of all men, I will readily inform you of it; and till this is done you should reject this doctrine as an awfully dangerous delusion.

THIRD EVENING.

Mr. B. continued:—

The holy Scriptures do teach the final holiness and happiness of all men, inasmuch as they teach that God is the Savior of all men. See 1 Tim. 4:10—“For therefore we both labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Savior of all men, especially of those that believe.” No well founded objection to argument founded upon the passage can be drawn from the present tense of the verb, *is*. For, strictly and philosophically speaking, there is nothing past or future with God; but all the events from the beginning to the end are continually present in his sight; this, the Scriptures plainly declare. See Isa. 46:10—“Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times to things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure.” Also, Acts 15:18—“Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world.” With the help of this truth, we are enabled to understand many passages which would otherwise be beyond our comprehension. Many passages might be cited by way of illustration; but it may be sufficient for our purpose to cite 2 Tim. 1:10—“Who hath abolished death,” &c. Now *death* here is said to be abolished, not because it is actually done, but because the event is certain in the counsels of God, of which he has given us this evidence, that He raised up Christ from the dead. In like manner we say God is the Savior of all men, because the event is certain in the divine counsels. Nor does the fact, that God is especially the Savior of believers, at all militate against the truth expressed in the first clause of the text, that “God is the Savior of all men,” but rather confirms the view I shall take of it. For in what sense, I ask, is God specially the Savior of believers? My brother will doubtless tell you that He is specially the Savior of believers here, by making them holy and happy here in proportion to the strength and efficacy of their faith. I then de-

mand of him a reason for interpreting the term Savior, in the first clause of the text, in a different sense from that in which he understands it in the last. If he says that God is specially the Savior of believers, by making them holy and happy—then I reply, that just in that sense is God the Savior of all men, by making them holy and happy. The doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all men is therefore established, by this argument, beyond the possibility of refutation.

Mr. H. replied:—

My opponent has quoted 1 Tim, 4:10, ‘For therefore we both labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Savior of all men, especially of those that believe,’ to prove the final holiness and happiness of all men. He *assumes* that the text refers to the immortal state. In connection with several irrelevant texts which he quoted to sustain this assumption, he remarked, ‘with the help of this truth, we are enabled to understand many passages which would otherwise be beyond our comprehension.’ With this kind of reasoning, almost any absurdity may be proved. That God is omniscient, as the texts improperly brought forward plainly show, is admitted. And that He sometimes speaks of things which are not as though they were, is also admitted. But that He so speaks in 1 Tim. 4:10, there is not a particle of proof either in the text or context, nor yet in the Bible! This is so obvious that I presume the text would not have been brought forward had not the words ‘all men’ been found in it; and hence the futile effort to prove its future reference. According to the argument which has been used to refer this text to the immortal state, Rom. 14:23, proves that some will be miserable there. ‘He that doubteth is [will be damned hereafter] if he eat. This reasoning makes the text read, God will be the Savior of all men hereafter, specially, here, those who believe. But this is mere nonsense. Farther: after the example of Mr. Balfour in another case, I shall not consent to have things relating to time and eternity blended together in this abrupt manner. That the special salvation is conditional and relates to time only, while the general salvation is unconditional and relates to eternity, must be proved before the passage will afford a semblance of support to universalism. Nothing however but inference, assertion, and assumption has yet been adduced on this subject; and such proofs I shall reject here as promptly as universalists do when it is adduced by their opponents. The meaning of the apostle seems to be simply this, God in some sense saves all mankind now; but believers are saved in an especial sense. This view of the subject appears to be taken in Romans 5:18, 19. ‘Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift

came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience, many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.' In the same sense, then, that 'all men' were made sinners by Adam's transgression, they are all made righteous, or SAVED, by the obedience of Christ. According to my opponent's reasoning, the phrase, 'who is the Savior of all men,' refers to the immortal state, while the term 'especially those that believe,' refers to this life. I now 'demand of him a reason' for applying one part of this short sentence to time and the other to eternity. It should be remembered that the text says not one word about the future state. Therefore 'the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all men' cannot be 'established' by any argument which can be drawn from the passage.

REJOINDER. Mr. B. rejoined as follows:—

It will be recollectcd that Br. Hutchins, in reply to my argument founded on the perfections of God, stated that all men are not saved now, and the love of God towards them is no evidence that they ever will be saved. He now tells you that God is the Savior of all men now. Which of these statements does he mean to have us believe? The point at issue between us on this passage in Tim. is not whether salvation is conditional, but whether the conditions are such as to falsify the declaration of the Apostle. As plain as that two and two make four, is the proposition that God is the Savior of none but those that are saved. A mere willingness to save does not constitute him a Savior, any more than a willingness to accept that office would constitute a man President of the United States. Nor would providing ineffectual means to save, entitle him to that appellation, any more than an unsuccessful endeavor to obtain that office, would entitle a man to the appellation of President. I might safely admit the conditionality of salvation to any extent that could rationally be desired, and it would not effect my argument in the least; since God has instituted no conditions that can in any event defeat His purposes or falsify His word. If, as my brother has once assured us, God is not the Savior of all men now, He must be hereafter, or the declaration contained in the text is not true. My brother may take which horn of the dilemma he pleases. I hardly know what to make of his assertion that "all men are saved now," that "all are made righteous now," unless he intends to set forth one of the peculiar beauties of his system, the doctrine of "imputed righteousness"—a doctrine at which reason stands aghast, and which "shocks all common sense." Is the drunkard, I ask, saved now? Is the thief, the robber, the murderer, the adulterer saved? Are these characters made righteous now? Truly, theirs must be a singular kind of righteousness. As to the assertion that the text says nothing about the future state, I may venture to leave it with the single observation,

that since it is manifest that all are not saved now, the only alternative that is left is either to conclude that the Apostle uttered a falsehood, or admit that all men will be saved in the future state.

Mr. H's. replication.

Because I stated in the first of this discussion that all men are not saved now, and remarked in my last reply that God is the Savior of all men now, I am indirectly accused of a contradiction. As my opponent wishes to know which of the above statements I would have believed, I answer both of them. When I said that all men are not saved now, I meant that they are not saved especially; and in the remark that God is the Savior of all men now, I meant that they are all saved in some sense different from an especial salvation. Hence both of my statements are true. I have never asserted that 'a mere willingness to save' constitutes God 'a Savior;' nor that 'providing ineffectual means to save' would 'entitle him to that appellation.' Therefore the introduction of what would not 'constitute a man President of the United States' does 'not effect my argument in the least.' When it is proved that God has promised to save all men hereafter, it will be time enough for my opponent to attempt to make it appear that my reasoning makes Him 'falsify His word.' The explanation which I have given of my meaning of the remark that God is not the Savior of all men now, makes 'the dilemma' of which my opponent speaks, a mere creature of his mistaken fancy. It is therefore as harmless as the impression which created it is groundless. Consequently his attempt to prove from my own statement either that God must save all men hereafter or his word is not true, is worse than nothing to his cause. He says he hardly knows what to make of my assertion that all men are made righteous now, &c. If he dont know what to make of Scriptural sentiments, I dont know as I can help him. I will however try to make myself understood on this subject. All men were *passively* condemned, in some sense, [not to endless misery,] by Adam's offence; EVEN so, mark that, the free gift came passively upon all men to justification of life, or freedom from condemnation *here*, [not in heaven.] Thus as far as man was made a sinner in Adam, he is made righteous in Christ, and no farther. As far, then, as the drunkard, thief, robber, murderer and adulterer was condemned in Adam, **he is** cleared from condemnation, or made righteous in Christ. If "reason stands aghast" at this doctrine, and if it "shocks all common sense," the fault is the Bible's rather than mine. Let it be understood, however, that nothing which Adam did condemned the sinner to misery in a future state independent of his own acts; also that nothing that Christ has done can make him holy and happy without obedience to God.

That 1 Tim. 4:10, does not sustain the affirmative of the

question before us, I argue from the fact that future salvation is conditional. This I showed in my last reply on the first evening of this discussion; but as what I said at that time has not been answered, I need not repeat the texts there adduced, to prove his conditionality. Farther: universalists contend that 'mankind will be rendered happy hereafter by being *made alive in Christ, in incorruption,*' &c. See Ely and Thomas' Theo. Dis. p. 236. 'This heavenly image which we lost, we obtain back again at the resurrection of the dead.' Univ. Guide, p. 37;—'They will be children of God, bearing a moral likeness to him. This will be the state of all who shall be raised from the dead.' Ib. p. 44. In order to sustain these views of the manner in which mankind will be rendered happy hereafter, the text before us should read, Therefore we both labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who will raise all men from the dead, especially those that believe. My opponent says 'it is manifest that all men are not saved now,' and therefore they must all be saved in the future state, or 'the Apostle uttered a falsehood.' Now mark it, my hearers; Paul says God is the Savior of all men, but my opponent says He is not, but he will be their Savior in the immortal state. I will leave it with the audience to judge which tells the truth. If it is decided that Paul did not utter a falsehood, 'it is manifest that' the text in question does not contain the slightest evidence of the final holiness and happiness of all men.

FOURTH EVENING.

Mr. B. resumed his argument.

The holy Scriptures teach the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all men, inasmuch as they teach that such shall be their condition in the resurrection. See Luke 20:35—38. "But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more: for they are equal to the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the dead; but of the living: for all live unto him." The expression, "They that shall be accounted worthy," cannot be used as an argument against the holiness and happiness of any portion of mankind, because it is affirmed that all are raised; that they shall be equal unto the angels. It can only be urged, therefore, as an objection to their resurrection. If it be admitted, as it must be, that angels, (or, as it is expressed in the parallel passage in Matt. 22:30, "the angels of God in heaven,") are holy and happy, then it must be admitted also, that those who are raised in a condition "equal unto"

them, are holy and happy likewise. There can therefore be no dispute about the holiness and happiness of such as are raised; and the whole question, so far as this passage is concerned, resolves itself simply into this, whether all men are to be raised from the dead. If, then, I can prove that all are to be raised, the argument in favor of the final holiness of all men is conclusive. But why, it may be asked, did our Savior say "they that shall be accounted worthy," if all are to be raised? In reply I say that several reasons might be given why this clause of the text cannot be considered as an objection to the resurrection of all men. 1st. The phrase in question is omitted by Matthew in his account of this discourse; and can we rationally conclude that he would omit what was, agreeably to the views of my brother H., the most important part of the account? This is quite too much to assume. 2d. To construe the phrase in question as an objection to the resurrection of any part of mankind, is to establish a direct contradiction between it and what is asserted in the 38th verse of this chapter: "For He is not a God of the dead, but of the living, for all live unto him"—and also to the declaration of Paul in 1 Cor. 15:22: "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Whatever this phrase may mean, therefore, it cannot mean that all, or any part of mankind, shall not be raised from the dead. Let my brother now show, if he can, why this passage is not conclusive in favor of the affirmative of the question.

Mr. H. answered:—

'The holy Scriptures' do not 'teach the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all men, inasmuch as they' no where assert that all men will be holy and happy 'in the resurrection.' Let my opponent bring one text which says that all mankind will be holy and happy in the resurrection, and his work will be done, for I will then cheerfully embrace his doctrine. The passage in Luke, so much relied on, affords no proof of the correctness of his position, for it says nothing about a universalist resurrection—the resurrection of all men to a holy and happy state. The Sadducees, who did not believe in the resurrection, came to Christ with the ease of a woman who had had seven husbands, and wished to know whose wife of these seven men she should be when the dead were raised. This they no doubt supposed would greatly embarrass him. But he obviated the intended difficulty by informing them that the marriage relation would not exist at the resurrection, and then proceeded to prove that all mankind will be raised from the dead. But as the doctrine of endless misery was believed at that time by the Jews, and as they allowed or admitted that the just and unjust would be raised, (see Acts 24:15,) it is evident that the Sadducees could not understand Christ to teach that all mankind will be holy and happy in consequence of the resurrection. If he designed to teach

universalism in his conversation with the Sadducees, it is singular that the Evangelists Mark and John did not record it. My opponent has asserted without anything like positive proof, that the expression, ‘They that shall be accounted worthy,’ can only be urged as an objection to the resurrection of some portion of mankind. But I meet this assertion by replying, that it can be urged ‘only as an objection to their’ being admitted into the state denoted by the phrase ‘that world,’ which is something different from ‘the resurrection of the dead,’ for that phrase is never used in the Bible to denote the act of reanimating the dead. Farther: Matthew omits much that Luke has recorded of Christ’s conversation with the Sadducees, including the phrase, ‘equal unto the angels,’ on which my opponent seems mainly to depend here to make out his case; ‘and can we rationally conclude that he would admit what was, agreeably to the views of my’ opponent, ‘the most important part of the account? This is quite too much to assume.’ The phrase, ‘equal unto the angels,’ was used by our Savior to show that those who are raised from the dead, cannot ‘die any more;’ but it is used this evening to show that all mankind will be holy and happy at the resurrection. It is now seen that he has yet to ‘show, if he can, why this passage is conclusive in favor of the affirmative of the question.’ And when he attempts this, let him prove that ALL MEN will ‘be accounted worthy to obtain that world;’ let him also prove that they will be holy and happy in the immortal state. As I have shown the fallacy of his reasoning on Luke 20:35—38, I might take my seat. But as I have consumed only a small portion of my time, I will show universalists that the same kind of arguments which their authors and ministers use to prove there is no future hell, will prove that this text applies wholly to this state, and consequently that there is no future existence.

1. The term ‘resurrection’ in the text just discussed, does not necessarily mean a rising into an immortal state. Rev. D. D. Smith, a popular universalist minister, in his discussion with Rev. Adin Ballou, a Restorationist, pp. 22, 23, says —“By consulting the lexicons we find that the Greek word, translated here [Luke 14:14.] and elsewhere in the New Testament *resurrection*, means sometimes, rising from darkness to light or obscurity to eminence. By giving this sense to the word, in the passage above, the whole is rendered perfectly plain. Christ intended to be understood that in the course of time, and the order of Providence, those poor people whom they might entertain, would be raised from the obscurity of their condition, and would fully recompense the favors they might have received in the times of their lowliness. Such is the plain and obvious meaning of this text which, when properly understood, cannot be considered as having any reference to that doctrine of future rewards and

punishments which is held by my friend." Such is Mr. Smith's reasoning on the phrase, *thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just,* to prove that the term resurrection here does not refer to the immortal state. Now apply similar reasoning to the text, 'they that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead,' &c. and it will read, They that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that age, and be raised from the obscurity of their present condition, neither marry nor are given in marriage, spiritually. Neither can they go into the obscurity of their present condition any more: for they are equal unto the angels of God, being the children of the rising 'from darkness to light.' Such is the plain and obvious meaning of the text which, when properly understood, cannot be considered as having any reference to a state beyond death. Speaking on the phrase, '*resurrection of damnation,*' Mr. A. C. Thomas says, Theo. Discussion, p. 186, "The word *resurrection* in the passage in John, affords no proof that the allusion is to a rising into an immortal state—for, as Dr. Campbell justly observes, 'this is neither the only, nor the primitive import of the word—It denotes simply, being raised from inactivity to action, or from obscurity to eminence, or a return to such a state, after an interruption.' Note in Mat. 22:23." Here Mr. T. gives Dr. Campbell's views on the word rendered resurrection in Mat. 22:23, to show that in John 5:29, it does not necessarily refer to the immortal state. By taking the same liberty that he takes here, his reasoning on the phrase '*resurrection of damnation*' may be applied to the phrase, '*resurrection from the dead,*' in Luke 20:35, and thus the reasoning of Mr. Smith and Mr. Thomas applied to this text, confines it wholly to this state! ! 2. I am informed that the term rendered '*world*' in the phrase '*that world,*' is precisely the same as that which is translated '*world*' in the phrase, '*shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.*' See Mat. 12:32. On this passage, Mr. Balfour says, 2d Inquiry, p. 292, 'It seems then a very obvious case, that when it is said the sin against the Holy Spirit shall not be forgiven in this world nor in the *world to come*, there is no reference to a state after death. It simply means, it should not be forgiven while the Jewish age or dispensation continued, nor under the age of the Messiah, which was then about to commence.' Mr. Whittemore, in his Guide, pp. 100, 101, testifies to the same thing. He says, "The language used by Matthew is, '*shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, nor the world to come.*' But it is very certain, that Matthew was not speaking of the mortal and immortal states of being, when he spoke of *this world and the world to come.* No, he had no reference to the immortal state of being in any way."—"Shall not be forgiven, neither in this world,' or *age*, which ended when

the gospel age began; ‘neither in the world,’ or age, ‘to come,’ that is, the age which succeeded it. Let us not be wise above what is written. Let us be willing to stop where the Bible stops.” I might make many similar quotations from universalist writers, to prove that the terms world, and world to come, which seem to be synonymous with the term ‘that world’ in Luke 20:35, do not in Bible meaning, refer to a state after death. But the testimony of these two witnesses against the future reference of the phrase, ‘that world,’ establishes the fact by universalist reasoning, that the text under consideration never ought to be applied to the immortal state, as it means only the age of the Messiah.

3. We will now hear Mr. Balfour’s testimony in relation to this matter. In his 2d Inquiry, p. 311, he writes, “In Luke 20:34—36, we have *this world* and *that world* mentioned, or, this age and that age or state. But as it requires no particular consideration, it is unnecessary to transcribe it. I would only remark, that *aionos* here cannot mean endless duration or forever. It would not do to say the children of this forever marry, and the children of that forever do not marry.” Here we are told that the terms, ‘*this world*’ and ‘*that world*,’ mentioned in the text, are synonymous with ‘this age and that age or state’—that the term ‘*aionos*,’ rendered world in these phrases, ‘CANNOT MEAN ENDLESS DURATION.’ According to what Mr. B. here testifies, the passage relates to this state only, unless he supposes that the immortal state is not *endless!* It is now seen, according to the evidence adduced from the writings of Messrs. Smith, Thomas, Whittemore, and Balfour, that the text quoted with so much confidence by my opponent, to prove the final holiness and happiness of all men, relates to nothing hereafter. Therefore he has entirely failed of his object by assuming the future reference of a text which universalist logic easily confines to this mode of existence. And as this is one of the *strongest* of the proof texts of universalists, the future reference of all the rest can be disproved as easily as I have done it in this case. Hence my statement that the same kind of arguments which universalists use to show that there is no future hell, will prove there is no future heaven—no future existence, is now fully sustained as far as the meaning of one of the most important texts in the Bible is concerned.

The audience may now see that universalists, to be consistent with their arguments against future punishment, ought strenuously to oppose the doctrine of man’s future existence.

REJOINDER. My brother H. has much to say about reading and quoting universalist authors. But if what he has given us is to be regarded as a specimen of his knowledge of those authors, I must say I pity him. It is quite evident,

from the manner in which he treats the authors whom he attempts to quote, that he either does not understand their meaning, or else he is guilty of perverting them. And from some remarks of his, I conclude that he treats his Bible much in the same manner. Had he taken the trouble to consult Mark 12:25, he would hardly have ventured the assertion that Mark took no notice of the resurrection spoken of in Luke. Mr. Balfour was written to respecting his views of the passage in Luke, and the following letter from him, which was subsequently introduced in the discussion, will be a sufficient reply to the remarks founded upon the passage quoted from the second Inquiry:

“CHARLESTOWN, May 6, 1841.

“BR. BULKELEY—Yours of April 30, favored by brother Stevens, I received when about to go into the country. I have returned, and shall now give you my views of Luke 20:34—36, in compliance with your request. As my health does not allow of my writing much, I shall study brevity in my remarks.

“In these verses, the phrases, ‘*this world*’ and ‘*that world*’ occur, and express two states which are set in contrast. There is no dispute about the phrase ‘*this world*;’ for its being said, ‘the children of this world marry and are given in marriage,’ shows what state is meant. The question is, what world is meant by ‘*that world*,’ which is in contrast with ‘*this world*.’ The words immediately added, ‘and the resurrection from the dead,’ seem to explain this: ‘*that world*’ and ‘*the resurrection from the dead*,’ express the same thing; the last phrase is an amplification or explanation of the first; the word *kai*, rendered *and*, which connects the two phrases, ought to be rendered *even*, as it is in many other places, and the words stand thus—‘The children of this world marry and are given in marriage. But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, *even* the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage,’ etc. The difficulty is supposed to be in the words ‘shall be accounted worthy.’ It is concluded, *some*, *yea*, *many*, shall not be accounted worthy to obtain ‘*that world*,’ or ‘*the resurrection from the dead*.’ But admit this conclusion, and it follows that *some*, *yea*, *many*, are to be annihilated, or not raised from the dead at all. But this view is not in unison with the doctrine of endless punishment. The whole difficulty arising from the phrase, ‘shall be accounted worthy,’ proceeds from overlooking the nature and extent of the contrast, stated in the passage and its context. ‘*This world*’ and ‘*that world*,’ or, as some render it, ‘*this state*’ and ‘*that state*,’ and ‘*this life*’ and ‘*that life*,’ are not only set in contrast, but also the persons and their conditions are contrasted. The children of ‘*this world*,’ verse 34, are contrasted with ‘*the children of God—the children of the resurrection*,’

verse 36. Besides, the children of ‘this world,’ *marrying and being given in marriage*, are contrasted with the children of ‘that world,’ who ‘neither marry nor are given in marriage.’ Keeping this contrast in view, let us now see how it bears on the words ‘shall be accounted worthy,’ where it is supposed an insurmountable difficulty lies. It is evident that the Sadducees denied that there was to be any resurrection; but with a view to perplex our Lord, they assumed it as true, and reasoning on the principle of analogy, concluded the resurrection state was to be similar to the present state. They introduced a woman who had been married to seven husbands, and the point of their argument was, whose wife she should be in the resurrection state. But our Savior told them they erred; and did not admit of analogical reasoning from the present to the future state. On the contrary he told them, ‘the children of this world marry and are given in marriage; but they which should be accounted worthy to obtain that world, even the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage.’ The contrast is between this world and the resurrection state, and their conditions in these two states. But the difficulty in the passage is created by overlooking this contrast and introducing one between two classes of persons in ‘that world,’ or ‘the resurrection state,’ a contrast which is not supported by the text or context. All admitted, that it was accounted worthy, fit, and honorable, to marry and be given in marriage in ‘this world,’ for this was for the good of mankind, and necessary for the continuance of our race. But nothing of this kind can be needed, or counted worthy, in ‘that world,’ or ‘the resurrection state,’ for these persons do not ‘die any more, but are as the angels of God in heaven.’

“Every candid man will admit, that the contrast stated in verses 34, 35, is between persons in this state and the resurrection state; and I think a candid man ought also to admit, that if he makes a distinction and a contrast among persons in the resurrection state, he is bound to show how this is proved from the passage in question. If he says the words, ‘shall be accounted worthy,’ imply this, I reply, he overlooks the contrast made in the context, and such a conclusion cannot be admitted, until he shows that a distinction and contrast is taught in it between worthy and unworthy persons in the resurrection state. But who will undertake to do this? I may add, such as undertake to do this, ought also to point out what any persons have done, or can do, to render themselves worthy to obtain the resurrection state, which others have left undone. All are, then, the children of God—why? because they were much better than many in this world? No, but ‘being children of the resurrection.’ Such are my views, and believe me to be

“Yours, truly,

W. BALFOUR.”

Mr. H. Replied:—

As my opponent charges me with not understanding the meaning of the universalist authors that I have quoted, or else I am ‘guilty of perverting them;’ and as he has not brought a particle of proof of his ungentlemanly charge, ‘I must say I pity him.’ Does he make charges which he *cannot* prove in order to maintain a cause which the Bible does not sustain? Notwithstanding the unkind manner in which he alludes to my error in stating that Mark did not speak of the resurrection mentioned in Luke 20:34—36, I thank him for correcting me. He has introduced a letter just received from Mr. Balfour, and read enough from it to show that that famous author has changed ‘his views of the passage in Luke’ since he published his 2d Inquiry. In that work, he virtually stated that the term ‘*that world*,’ [*aionos*] ‘cannot mean endless duration.’ But in his letter he makes the term *equivalent* ‘to the resurrection of the dead,’ ‘*the resurrection state*,’ &c. which of course implies endless duration. I now take this opportunity to caution the audience to be very careful how they receive the opinions of a man who has entirely changed his views of the meaning of one of the most important portions of the word of God. His present views of the *reference* of the phrase, *that world*, are, no doubt, agreeable to the Bible. But they are utterly unreconcilable with what he has written at length on the meaning of the terms ‘world,’ and ‘*that world*,’ in his second inquiry, the reading of which almost compels one to think he secretly intended to confine the whole of man’s happiness to this existence, as his first Inquiry and part of his second, are open efforts to confine all punishment and misery to this life! Both of these works may be used as successfully against the interpretations which universalists give many texts in the Bible, as they now use the writings of Whitby, Lightfoot, Campbell, &c., against the Scripture interpretations of their opponents.

As Mr. Bulkeley has published in this discussion a letter from Mr. Balfour, from which he read only a short extract or two when it was ‘introduced,’ I shall reply to it here. The reader will therefore see that the following remarks, which were not made during the controversy, no more belong to the debate than the letter does to which they are a reply. The contents of Mr. Balfour’s letter consist of a futile attempt to sustain the assumption that “‘*that world*’ and ‘*the resurrection from the dead*,’ express the same thing.” To this assertion I reply:—

1. In language somewhat similar to his on 1 Pet. 5:8;— ‘Not one instance can I find where the term ‘world’ is used in the Bible to denote the resurrection from the dead. If it is so in this passage, [Luke, 20:34—36] it is a solitary instance, which is presumptive evidence that it was not the Savior’s ‘meaning.’ See 2d Inq. p. 121. Scriptural use,

even according to his own showing, is positively against such an application of the term here rendered *world*. ‘Let this be remembered.’

2. He published to the world fifteen years ago, as I have shown before, that this term in Luke ‘cannot mean endless duration,’ and consequently it cannot mean a resurrection state. And unless he is *certain* that his opinion is entitled to more consideration now than it was then, his present exposition is, to say the least, extremely doubtful.

3. His criticism on the word *kai*, rendered *and* by our translators, which makes the text read, ‘they that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, even the resurrection from the dead,’ cannot, I think, be sustained. In order to test its correctness, I will try it on Heb. 6:2—‘Resurrection of the dead, even eternal judgment.’ It seems to me that it is just as consistent and scriptural, to make the ‘resurrection of the dead’ synonymous with eternal judgment, as it is to make the term ‘that world’ mean the resurrection of the dead.

4. Restorationists, who, it is said by Mr. Whittemore, are universalists, are against Mr. Balfour’s views of the passage in Luke. Dr. Chauncey, in his *Salvation of All Men*, London, 1784, p. 390, says—“He [Christ] connects the *salvation of the righteous* with the *damnation of the wicked*, in point of time, so does he their *resurrection* in that observable passage, John 5:28, 29, ‘The hour is coming, in the which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth: They that have done good, to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, to the resurrection of damnation.’ It appears then, upon the whole, that, at the end of the world, or the second coming of Christ, the *wicked*, as well as the *righteous*, shall be *raised from the dead*.” In the same work, p. 376, he paraphrases Rev. 20:12, thus—“I then beheld in my vision the dead raised, both high and low, young and old, and they stood before the throne of God, and were judged in a most fair and equal manner, according to their works, whether they had been good or evil. And that this retribution might be *absolutely universal*, taking in the whole race of men, the dead, without distinction or limitation, were raised again to life, whether they died and were buried in the sea, or whether they died on the land and were buried in the grave; all in the invisible state of the dead were brought to life, and judged according to their works.” These quotations from Dr. Chauncey, show that he considered that there will be a distinction among persons in the resurrection state,—that some will be raised to life, and others to damnation. Thus it is seen that the doctrine of the punishment of the wicked at the resurrection, is so evident from the Bible, that Dr. Chauncey openly avows it, as Restorationists generally do. Hence, according to the opinion of by far the largest

portion of universalists in Christendom, Luke 20:34—36, affords no proof whatever of the final holiness and happiness of all men!!

5. I cannot learn that any commentator or lexicographer, has ever considered that the term, ‘that world,’ means the resurrection of the dead. Therefore Mr. Balfour is as much opposed to ‘the learned world’ in relation to the meaning of the term in question, as he is to the Bible and the largest and most intelligent portion of his own sect. Consequently his ‘views’ on this subject are unauthorised and unscriptural.

6. The term resurrection state, used by Mr. Balfour, is ‘not found in the Bible.’ Hence according to his own reasoning against an eternal hell, this ‘language is coined at the mint of modern divinity,’ and may do very well to increase ‘a sect, but this is a very different thing from making men Christians.’

7. He *thinks* that if one ‘makes a distinction and a contrast among persons in the resurrection state, he is bound to show how this is proved from the passage in question.’ To this I reply, that if he admits that those who are raised from the dead will dwell in heaven, ‘I think he is bound to show how this is proved from the passage before us. He should remember that there is no more said here, nor yet in the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians, about dwelling with the Lord, than there is about a distinction among those who are raised. Therefore I am no more bound to prove this distinction from the text, than he is to prove from it the future residence of all men in heaven.

8. As Christ plainly intimates that some ‘shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world,’ which Mr. Balfour now admits is in the future state, as he says some shall walk [not are walking] with him ‘in white: for they ARE WORTHY,’ (see Rev. 3:4, 5;) as he has never said that all men shall be accounted worthy to obtain a state of happiness after the resurrection; as I have shown that the term, ‘that world’ does not mean the resurrection of the dead; and as I have never supposed mankind will be raised from the dead on account of their worthiness, I am under no obligation ‘to point out what any persons have done, or can do, to render themselves worthy to obtain the heavenly *world*, ‘which others have left undone.’ According to Mr. B.’s views, the words ‘accounted worthy,’ have no meaning, and thus he charges Christ with folly in uttering them! But if he will read John 5:29, he will see that those who ‘have done good’ will be *accounted worthy* to come forth ‘to the resurrection of life.’

9. I have already stated that the Scriptural use of the original word rendered ‘world’ in the text under discussion, according to Mr. B.’s own showing, does not allow him to apply this text to a future state. On Mat. 24:3, he remarks,

"The Greek phrase here for 'the end of the world,' is *sun-teleia tou aionos*. Dr. Campbell renders it 'the conclusion of this state;' and Wakefield and Macknight, the end of the age,'" which view of the expression, Mr. B. says is 'correct.' He soon adds, 'But if it means age, it ought to be understood so in other places, unless good reasons can be offered why it ought to be differently understood.' 2d Inq. pp. 274—5. On the phrase *world to come*, which seems to mean the same thing as 'that world,' which, in Luke 20:34—36, he now applies to a future state, he quotes several orthodox writers with approval, and says, 'they establish beyond all contradiction, that the phrase *world to come*, does not mean the future eternal state of existence after death, but the age of the Messiah.' On Eph. 1:21, 'not only in this world, but also in that to come,' expressions which seem to be of precisely the same meaning as 'this world' and 'that world' in Luke, he gives Wakefield's rendering of the text, which is as follows; 'not only in this but in the future age.' And this future age, we have just seen, does not mean the future eternal state of existence after death. The passage in Matt. 12:32, 'it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come,' is, as I have before shown, applied by Mr. B. to 'the Jewish age,' and 'the age of the Messiah,' in this state of existence! See 2d Inq. pp. 290—292. Now till he offers 'good reasons why' the term *that world* in Luke 20:35, should be understood as referring to the 'eternal state of existence after death,' he destroys either his reputation as a critic, or his candor. Hence it seems, that, in order to sustain a favorite system, Mr. B. has inconsiderately overthrown his criticisms on the word rendered *world*; and thus he must admit either that the Pharisees shall not be forgiven in the future state, or that the term 'that world,' in Luke, refers only to this state! !

10. I will now show by the same kind of reasoning which he uses to prove there is no future judgment, that he ought not to believe in a future resurrection. This will show that he was more consistent when he asserted that the terms *this world* and *that world*, 'cannot mean endless duration,' than he is now in saying that the term *that world*, means the resurrection state. The following are the arguments to which I allude—Let us now consider, what Toroaster says shall take place at the end of the world, and compare it with the creed of most Christians. He says—'then there shall be a general resurrection.' This he could not learn from the Old Testament, for it does not teach such a doctrine, and when he made his creed, the New was not in existence. The phrase 'general resurrection,' used by him, is that now used by Christians, and in the same sense as he used it. But I ask, how Toroaster could learn either this sentiment or its phraseology from the Old Testament? If he did, intelligent

and learned orthodox men have erred greatly in admitting that this doctrine is not taught at all, or at least very doubtfully in the Old Testament. Brethren, from what divine source did this arch impostor learn this article of his creed? Was it from the Old Testament? If this book contains it, then you can find it there as well as Toroaster, and I call on you to prove it from this source. Did he learn it from God, when he pretended God spoke to him out of the midst of the fire? This cannot be affirmed unless you admit him to be a true prophet of the Lord, which we know he was not. It must be admitted that he invented this article of his creed, or it must be proved that he derived it from the Old Testament, or by special revelation from God. If he invented the doctrine of a general resurrection, then he was the author of one of the principal articles of your creeds. It will not do to say that this doctrine was derived from the New Testament, for on this supposition Christ had not the honor of first revealing it to the world. If this article is found in that book, Jesus Christ and his apostles were indebted to this impostor for inventing it. Should you say, that they derived this article from God by immediate revelation, permit me then to ask, who revealed it to Toroaster six hundred years before the Christian era? Did God reveal it to him? If he did, why not allow him to have been a true prophet of the Lord? And why not frankly own, that Christ and his apostles did not first reveal this article of faith to the world, but that God first revealed it through his great prophet Toroaster? Let those then, who contend for this doctrine, consider its origin; for to build their faith on the New Testament as its source, is worse than the Old; for it makes the writers not revealers of a new doctrine, nor teaching one before revealed in the Old Testament, but adopting a sentiment and language, which originated in the Magian creed, was transmitted by the great impostor Toroaster, and through the Apocryphal writers to Christ and his apostles, and from them to all Christians, ever since. The preceding reasoning, mostly in Mr. Balfour's own language, is abridged from his 2d Inq. pp. 73—92, where the reader can find much more of the same kind of logic, which is just as conclusive against a 'general resurrection' as it is against a general judgment.' But the arguments that I have here introduced, show conclusively that he could very easily make it appear, in his peculiar way, that Luke 20:34—36, has no reference to a future state if any thing relating to punishment was connected with it! It also shows how little importance should be attached to his criticisms—that his reasoning is well calculated to make infidels. I have written at this length in reply to his letter not because it requires so much to show the fallacy of his arguments; but to show how inconsistent he is with himself, and how easily his own reasoning may be made to confine the

whole of man's existence to this life. I do this with the hope of releasing from their embarrassment, some who may be entangled with universalist arguments against future punishment.

My 'view' of the meaning of the text before us is simply this—By the remark, 'they that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection of the dead,' our Savior meant, they that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world *at* the resurrection of the dead, &c. This is the only view which makes good sense of the phrase, they that shall be *accounted worthy*. What I have said on this subject shows that one of the most important texts used by universalists, is *grossly perverted* whenever it is quoted to prove their doctrine, if their reasoning on future punishment is conclusive. I will only add, that if Mr. Balfour, or any of his friends, will select a text which they think proves the doctrine of the general resurrection, I will show by his own reasoning on other subjects, that the passage is not future in its reference.

FIFTH EVENING.

Mr B. continued:—

The holy Scriptures teach the final holiness and happiness of all men, inasmuch as they teach that all evil and the author of evil shall be destroyed. It will be borne in mind, that the endless existence of mankind is not a point in dispute between us. Their immortality is conceded at the outset and the question in debate is, what is to be their condition in the immortal state. If, then, I prove the destruction of all that is adverse to their holiness and happiness, the inference is plain, that all will be holy and happy. All evils that can fairly be alledged to exist as obstacles to the holiness and happiness of the entire race of mankind, may be comprehended under the four following heads—The Devil—Sin—Hell, and Death.

1st. The destruction of the devil is taught in the very beginning of Revelation. See Gen. 3:15. We there find that no sooner had man transgressed the law first given, and rendered himself obnoxious to the divine denunciation, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," than God gave him this assurance of ultimate and complete triumph over the tempter. The "seed of the woman," by the consent of all commentators, refers to Christ; and this is regarded by Christians of all denominations as the first promise of a Savior. The plain import of the promise is, that Christ, "the seed of the woman," shall destroy the tempter, as signified by bruising the serpent's head. It matters not in our present argument, whether we regard this serpent or tempter as a literal, personal being, who was once an angel of light, but in consequence of pride and rebellion was hurled from

his seat of purity and bliss above, down to our earth, to deceive and torment the nations; or whether we regard it, in what we conceive to be the more rational view of the subject, as a personification of the prince of evil. In either view of the case, the argument from this promise is conclusive, as to the fact of his ultimate destruction. No stronger term, it appears to us, could have been made use of to denote this truth, than that of bruising the serpent's head. If there could be a doubt concerning the meaning of this figure, it would be removed at once by the testimony of the Apostle, Heb. 2:14—"For as much then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." Where now is Br. Hutchins' God? He told us, you will recollect, in his first reply, that if we proved there was no devil, he would prove there is no God. Alas! for the God that he adores, when Christ shall have accomplished the destruction of the devil.

2d. We might reasonably infer the destruction of sin, from the destruction of the author of it; as when the cause is destroyed, the effect must cease, of course. But to remove all doubts on this matter the following passages are deemed sufficient for any candid mind: 1 John, 3:8. Heb. 9:26. John 1:29.

3d. The destruction of hell is declared in Hosea 13:14—"I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction: repentance shall be hid from mine eyes." Let it be remembered that the original word translated "grave" in this passage, is the same that is translated "hell" in Psalms, 9:17, and in every instance where the word hell occurs in the Old Testament. Also, see Rev. 20:13, 14—"And death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire." Where now is brother Hutchins' heaven? He has told us, you will recollect, and it appears to be one of his strongest arguments—that if we will prove there is no hell, he will prove there is no heaven. And as he seems to place great stress upon this, and has seen fit to repeat it several times, it may be proper to digress a little, for the purpose of examining it more fully.

To bring this objection to the test at once, let me ask, Was there ever a time, when God and heaven did not exist? The answer must be, No. Was there ever a time, when a devil and a hell did not exist? The answer must be, Yes. Then a God and heaven have existed without a devil and a hell—and the conclusion is, that a God and heaven *may* exist without a devil and a hell. We do not, as this objection intimates, deny the existence of a devil and a hell; on the contrary we admit the existence of both, but contend for their

final and eternal destruction, as has been proved by the passages before quoted.

4th. The destruction of death is explicitly declared by the Apostle, in 1 Cor. 15:26—"The last enemy shall be destroyed, death." In quoting this passage, I have left out the words supplied by the translators, as not necessary to express the true meaning of the passage. In this I am justified by the example of the orthodox commentator Dr. Macknight, who translates it thus, "The last enemy, death, shall be destroyed." An improved version of the Scriptures, published in London some years since, has it thus, "death, the last enemy, shall be destroyed." Taken in either form, the text contains these two propositions—1st, Death is the last enemy. 2d, The last enemy shall be destroyed—both of which are susceptible of the clearest and most abundant proof. Indeed, they need no proof, for they stand as the solemn and uncontradicted declaration of God's holy word; and none can consistently question the truth of either, but the sceptic, and the atheist. Grant me but this one truth, that the last enemy shall be destroyed, and with this single lever, I will overturn every system of partialism that ever existed beneath the sun. It is perfectly idle, futile, and vain, in the light of this proposition, to talk about "eternal death," an "immortal devil," or "an endless hell"—for though there were ten thousand deaths mentioned in the Scriptures—as many devils—as many hells—it must be entirely obvious to every mind not lost to sense and reason, that not one of them can survive for a moment the destruction of the last enemy. What, then, I solemnly ask, in view of the fact that all these—the devil, sin, hell, and death—yea, the last enemy, including of course every thing that in its nature is opposed to God and holiness, shall be destroyed, can prevent the final holiness and happiness of all mankind?

Mr. H. replied:—

The argument to which you have just listened, is nothing more than an "inference" drawn from the fact that the Devil, Sin, Hell, and Death are to be destroyed. And this *inferential* argument is based on the *assumption* that to destroy, is to annihilate.

1. My opponent takes the position that the devil, who he calls the "serpent or tempter," is "a personification of the prince of evil." This is the only view he can well take of the subject; for if this tempter was once "an angel of light," and if to destroy is to annihilate, it follows either that this angel was not immortal, or that an immortal being will be annihilated. His remarks seem to imply that the serpent mentioned in Gen. 3:1, 4, 15, is only evil personified. What, or who does he suppose is "the prince of evil?" I would also inquire, in nearly Mr. Thomas' language to Dr. Ely, What authority has he for supposing that one part of this

chapter is *figurative* and the other *literal*? If the serpent is to be understood *figuratively*, the beasts, fowls, &c. must also be understood figuratively. Where, then, is his argument? See Theo. Dis. p. 127. Let him remember, that, before his argument can be considered conclusive, he must prove that to destroy means to annihilate, and then he may quote Heb. 2:14, to some purpose. I readily admit, however, that the devil and his works, hades, and death, will be destroyed in some sense, but that their destruction implies the final holiness and happiness of all men, remains to be proved by something more than inferences and assumptions.

2. John 1:29, and Heb. 9:26, will avail my opponent nothing till he proves that Christ will take away, and 'put away sin,' even the sins of all who die in rebellion, *in the immortal state*. And when he shows that the sins of mankind constitute 'the works of the devil,' he may quote 1 John 3:8, to some purpose, if he can make it plain that men are condemned for the devil's works.

3. According to what Mr. Balfour says in his 1st. Inquiry on Hos. 13:14, Psa. 9:17, and Rev. 20:13, 14, these texts, and all others 'where the word hell occurs in the Old Testament,' allude to nothing more than the grave or the place of the dead. And this my opponent seems to admit. These passages, then, can refer to nothing more than the destruction of natural death and the grave, at the resurrection. Hence, as these do not make mankind unholy and unhappy, their destruction has nothing to do with the final holiness and happiness of all men, and the argument based on the destruction of hell, has no bearing on this subject. The only way these texts can be made to sustain universalism, is, to prove that the act of raising men from the dead, renders them holy and happy, which cannot be done. I might easily show by universalist logic, that not one of the texts quoted by my opponent to prove the destruction of hell, refers to the immortal state. But the present state of the question makes it unnecessary. As I have never intimated that the existence of God and heaven depends on the existence of the devil and hell, why does my opponent reply to an argument which I never used? Till he proves that heaven means a place of future bliss, while hell does not mean a place of future misery, he entirely evades my statement and misrepresents my argument, in all he says on this subject.

4. Let us see if 'the destruction of death' necessarily implies the final holiness and happiness of all men. As this appears to be my opponent's strongest argument, I shall pay considerable attention to it. I admit his rendering of the passage, 'The last enemy shall be destroyed, death;' and he must admit from the connection in which the text stands, that natural death only is intended by the apostle. That the

destruction of death does not secure the ultimate happiness of all men may be seen by considering—

1. That hades and death mentioned in Hos. 13:14, are the same as those named in 1 Cor. 15:54, 55, and Rev. 20:13,14. This must be admitted, or else it must be proved that one death and one hades have been already cast into the lake of fire, while another death and another hades remain to be destroyed at the immortal resurrection, a work which I think will not be undertaken. If they are now destroyed, their destruction has nothing to do with the subject before us. Nor will their destruction at the end of time secure the final holiness and happiness of all men, for the wicked are to be cast into the lake of fire with them. See Rev. 20:13—15, and 21:8. To say that they shall ever come out of this state, is to be wise above what is written, which Messrs. Balfour, Whittemore, and others, positively condemn in their reasoning on other subjects.

2. The apostle simply labors in 1 Cor. 15th chapter, to prove that there will be a resurrection. It had been asserted ‘that there is no resurrection of the dead.’ See v. 12. This assertion he controverts throughout the chapter.

3. Not a word is here said about the final holiness and happiness of all men.

4. That the dead are to be raised immortal, according to verses 53,54, affords no proof of universalism. For in Rom. 2:7, we learn that immortality is something to be sought for in order to obtain eternal life.

5. Nor does the phrase, ‘we shall bear the image of the heavenly,’ verse 49, imply their holiness. It is said in James 3:9, that men ‘are made after the *similitude* of God.’ In what sense they are thus ‘made,’ we are not told; but that it is in a sense that constitutes them holy and happy, we have no evidence. Nor can we know that their bearing the image of the heavenly at the resurrection, will make them holy and happy. Nor yet is it asserted by Paul, that the wicked will bear this image.

6. The conclusion of the chapter shows that he did not argue the doctrine of universalism. For from what he had said, he exhorted his brethren to always abound in the work of the Lord, as they knew their labor was not in vain. This implies that they would be rewarded at the resurrection. But had he labored to prove the unconditional salvation of all men, he would have concluded the chapter thus—Therefore rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory, forasmuch as ye know that all mankind will be raised holy and happy.

7. Natural death is called the last enemy; but as sin and guilt exist here independent of death, they may on the same principle, exist after that is destroyed. As the existence of sin and misery does not depend on death, it cannot be proved that its destruction will put an end to condemnation.

8. It is said that ALL ENEMIES, mark that, shall be put under Christ's feet. 1 Cor. 15:25. In the next verse it is said that death the last enemy,—one of those just mentioned—shall be destroyed; and the following verse says, For he hath [will, say universalists] put all things under his feet. Hence as all enemies are to be put under him, death, being one of them, must be included. To put under Christ's feet in the universalist sense of the term, is to subdue to his government. On this supposition it follows that hades, the devil, sin and death, are to become the subjects of Christ's government. But as death is to be put under his feet, *with all other enemies*, it follows that this act will not make any of them holy and happy.

9. Mark it, my hearers, death is to be destroyed before the end comes. Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power, see v. 24. Universalists have written much to prove that 'the end' came when Jerusalem was destroyed; and, according to their reasoning, the last enemy, death, was destroyed 1800 years ago. But aside from this universalist sophistry, let it be remembered, that, after all things, including death of course, are put down by Christ, he will give up the kingdom to the Father, and God will be all in all. This is to be done at the resurrection, after which natural death cannot exist.

10. In John 5:29, Acts 24:15, and Heb. 6:2, we learn that the wicked are to be raised to a state of condemnation. The original word in these texts translated 'resurrection,' and 'resurrection of the dead,' 'is the same that is translated' resurrection of the dead in the 15th chapter of 1 Corinthians. Thus we see that after Christ puts down *all* rule, authority, and power, the wicked are to be raised to damnation, and eternal judgment is to take place; and this too AFTER the destruction of hades, the devil, his works, and death, the last enemy. Where now is my opponent's argument for the final holiness and happiness of all men, which he so confidently based on the destruction of death? If he turns Restorationist and admits that there may be limited punishment after the resurrection, he abandons his argument drawn from the destruction of the last enemy; and if he denies the future reference of John 5:29, Acts 24:15, and Heb. 6:2, I shall also deny the future reference of the 15th chapter of 1 Corinthians, which Mr. Whittemore says is the Magna Charta, or great charter of universalism. And I can prove that this chapter relates only to this existence by the same kind of reasoning that will prove there is no future judgment. 'Let this be remembered.' 'What then, I solemnly ask, in view of these facts, is there in the destruction of death, to insure 'the final holiness and happiness of all mankind?' I will on-

I add that should I be called on to prove the future reference of the phrase, 'resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment,' I should say, that, as universalists reason on the resurrection where it is connected with punishment, I could not do it. But I would then show by their logic that every text in the Bible which mentions the resurrection, may be confined to this state; and this would show that the reasoning of universalists carried out, leads just where I have always told them it does,—to the doctrine of no future existence. What an awful responsibility those assume who labor so hard to make it appear that men cannot commit sin enough to peril their immortal interests; and how alarming is the state of those, who, through this belief, neglect to seek the Lord while he may be found. For worlds I would not take the place of either. May God open the eyes of those who are deceived with hopes not sanctified by His word. As universalism claims this sanction, I consider it more dangerous than open Infidelity. This claims reason only, for its support, but that appeals to the Bible, while both entirely fail to reform the vicious. Infidelity makes reason say, there is no future danger for the sinner, and universalism makes the Bible say the same thing. The former makes crime either the work of chance, or something that God does not regard: but universalism says, that, notwithstanding God forbids men to sin, and punishes the disobedient, yet the darkest crimes are in accordance with his will and purpose! Hence this doctrine is more calculated to make men secure in sin than Infidelity is.

Mr. B. replied:

The holy scriptures teach the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all men, inasmuch as this is a legitimate conclusion from the promises therein contained. See Genesis 12:3; 22:18; and Acts 3:25. "And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." "And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice." "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed." That this promise is absolutely universal, is evident from the terms in which it is conveyed. Had only the original expression, "In thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," been used, we should then have thought it universal; as it seems evident to us, that the phrase, "all the nations of the earth," must include the whole human family. But then my brother H. might have said, True, the promise speaks of all the nations of the earth; but parts of nations, as families and individuals, may be excepted, and still the promise remain good to all to whom it was given. Or had only the expression "all the families

of the earth" been used, he might have objected on the ground that to bless some of the families would be a fulfillment of the promise. But as if the Holy Spirit had foreseen the spirit of caviling that would exist in the world, and designed to guard against its seducing influence in the strongest manner, another expression, if possible, still more unequivocal than the two former, is used. The Apostle, in Acts 3, substitutes the word "kindreds" for that of families and nations—and thus to render assurance doubly sure, taken in all the various applications of it, we have the strong and emphatic declaration, "In thee and in thy seed shall all the nations, families, and kindreds of the earth be blessed." Now if an individual can be found, who belongs to no nation or family, and who has no kindred, I will grant that he may be the subject of an endless curse, for I can find no promise that will apply to his case. But until such an individual can be pointed out, I trust that Br. H., and all who sympathize in his religious views, will refrain from any attempt to show that the several expressions used in the promise mean anything less than absolute universality. All nations, families and kindreds of the earth, must mean every individual of the human race, from Adam down to his latest posterity. It only remains, therefore, to show what is the nature of the blessing referred to, to complete the argument. On this point, the language of the Apostle is very explicit. See Gal. 3:8, 16. "And the scriptures, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, *saying*, In thee shall all nations be blessed." "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." The plain meaning of this promise is, therefore, that all the nations, families, and kindreds of the earth shall be blessed in Christ; and not only so, but they are to be blessed with the blessings of the gospel. It will not do, therefore, for my brother to take the ground that some do, and say that the promise to Abraham relates merely to temporal blessings, for this would be to take away that most glorious feature of the gospel, referred to in 2 Tim. 1:10.—"Who (Christ) hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel."

Will my brother then say that the gospel is a system of temporal blessings merely? Or will he deny that it contains the blessings of immortality? He must do this, or abandon the position, that the promise to Abraham is temporal in its nature; for I have shown from the language of the Apostle, that the blessing referred to is the gospel, through which life and immortality are brought to light. But another objection may be urged against this view of the subject. By far the greater portion of the nations, and millions on millions of the families and kindreds of the earth, are ignorant of the gos-

pel. They have never heard of a Savior. And are these countless multitudes, who "are perishing for lack of knowledge," temporally blessed in Christ? Do they enjoy the temporal blessings of the gospel? How utterly futile and idle is the supposition. Yet all these are included, as we have seen, in the terms of the promise. They must therefore receive the blessing in the final state, or not at all. Yes: either these hapless multitudes of our kindred race, who through no fault of theirs, but that of having been born in heathen lands, are left to grope their way through this world of darkness, ignorance, and idolatry, and at last to lie down in the grave of despair, shall hereafter participate in the blessings of the gospel, and bask in the sunshine of immortality, or the promise given to the patriarchs is but an idle tale sent forth from the fountain of Infinite Wisdom to mock the woes of suffering humanity. But a final objection to the notion of the temporal nature of this promise is presented in the facts set forth in Heb. xi. The Apostle after referring to the patriarchs and prophets, and all those holy men and women of old, who had distinguished themselves as the servants of God, concludes his reference to them with these remarkable words: "And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." If then, as the apostle assures us, those worthies who had centuries previous gone to their final rest, "received not the promise," how could it relate to temporal blessings in their case?—with what show of propriety can it be so construed in relation to any portion of the human family? These considerations are deemed a sufficient refutation of the objection that none but temporal blessings are included in the promise. It will be perceived at a glance that ~~the~~ terms on which this promise was originally given, are absolute and unqualified. Human language does not contain, and is inadequate to express a more positive affirmation than is contained in this promise to Abraham. "In thee shall all nations be blessed." And the same may be said of every instance in which it is repeated. It is not true, therefore, as some pretend, and as my brother will doubtless try to make you believe, that the promise is conditional. Should he take this ground, I have *high* authority to quote against him. And since he has made free with his quotations from authors, I trust that he will not complain if I follow his example for once. I quote from a discourse on Isaiah 25:8, written and published by one Elias Hutchins. On page 5 of the discourse, we find the following sage position laid down with reference to the text. "To say, then, that it relates to another state, is begging the question—it is taking that for granted which ought to be proved." "*But it says no such thing.* Therefore, it is adding to the infallible word

of God to give it such a meaning." Again, on page 15: "To say that he referred to another world, when he says nothing about it, is to be wise above what is written—is to say that he either could not or did not express himself intelligibly." Now, without at all assenting to the correctness of this reasoning as applied to the passage in Isaiah, I may be allowed to observe, that it applies with singular force and propriety to the promise made to Abraham; and with but a slight variation from his language, we may say in reference to the alledged conditionality of the promise, "To say it means conditions, when it does not say conditions, is taking that for granted which ought to be proved." Did the promise say that "all the nations, families, and kindreds of the earth shall be blessed" conditionally, we should be in duty bound to believe the assertion. "*But it says no such thing.*" Therefore, it is adding to the infallible word of God to give it such a meaning." "To say that it means conditions, when it says nothing about conditions, is to be wise above what is written—is to say he either could not or did not express himself intelligibly." My brother must not now be allowed to back out of his position, and if he is willing to abide by his own propositions, not another word need be added to show the absurdity and folly of supposing this promise is in any sense conditional. But lest there should be some here so incorrigibly sceptical as not to be willing to admit that my Br. H. is the best authority in matters of this kind, I deem it necessary to quote from a source better entitled to the respect and confidence of those who are seeking for truth. The inspired apostle in 2 Cor. 1:20, gives us the following explicit testimony concerning the unconditional nature of this promise. "All the promises of God in him are Yea, and in him Amen, unto the glory of God by us." This, we think, to reasonable minds, ought to be a final settlement of the question. But still further objections may be argued against the idea of such conditions as limit the promise, or exclude from its blessings any portion of the human family. Millions on millions of the nations, families, and kindreds of the earth have lived and died in ignorance of the promise. How can it be reconciled either with the justice or goodness of God, that he should promise them a blessing upon conditions, and withhold from them all knowledge of these conditions until they have passed from this state of being, where alone it is possible to comply with them, or where a compliance with them will be of any avail. The supposition is too monstrous to be indulged in for a moment. We rest, then, in the conclusion that the promise is absolute and unconditional—that it relates to the blessings of life and immortality brought to light through the gospel, and that it is to be the final portion of all men.

Mr. H. answered:—

Near the close of his argument founded on the destruction of death, my opponent told you that with that ‘single lever he would overturn every system of partialism that ever existed beneath the sun.’ Yes he would make the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all men so plain that none ‘but the sceptic and atheist,’ or those ‘lost to sense and reason,’ could ‘question the truth of’ it. But it seems that he mistook either the power of this ‘lever,’ or his ability to use it; for he has not attempted to reply to my argument which shows that there will be *eternal judgment* after hades, the devil, his works, and death, are destroyed. He now attempts to sustain the affirmative of the question by the promise made to Abraham, which is recorded in Gen. 12:3; 22:18; and Acts 3:25—‘In thee [Abraham] shall all families of the earth be blessed.’ ‘In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice,’ &c. This blessing, he assumes, is ‘life and immortality;’ a blessing to be conferred upon all men through Christ the ‘seed’ of Abraham. Let him remember, that it is as positively said, that all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in Abraham as it is that they shall be blessed in Christ. Also that it is said that in this patriarch’s ‘seed’ they shall all be thus blessed, because he ‘obeyed’ God’s ‘voice.’ But how the blessing of ‘life and immortality’ is to be given to all men in or through Abraham, or how his obedience to God can secure it to them through Christ, I have yet to learn. I wish to know how mankind are to be blessed in the immortal state on account of what ‘the friend of God’ did in this life; and to these subjects I call the attention of my opponent. To prove ‘that this promise is absolutely universal,’ that is, that it includes every one of Adam’s family down to the end of time, the terms, all the nations of the earth, all the kindreds of the earth, are adduced. Now let us test this reasoning by applying it to other subjects. ‘Then will I—make this city a *curse* to all the nations of the earth:’ Jer. 26:6. Now “as it seems evident” to my opponent, “that the phrase, ‘all the nations of the earth,’ must include the whole human family,” he must admit that God threatened to make the city of Jerusalem a curse to all the human race. ‘Then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn:’ Matt. 24:30. ‘All kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him:’ Rev. 1:7. These texts prove as conclusively that God’s threatenings are ‘absolutely universal,’ as those quoted for that purpose, prove that His promises are so. Therefore it is as evident that all men will wail because of Christ in the immortal state, as it is that they will be blessed in him there. The congregation can now clearly see the absurdity of my opponent’s reasoning on the promises of God. The text he quotes from Galatians, to answer his purpose, should read, And, the scriptures,

foreseeing that God would render all men holy and happy hereafter, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed, &c. To 'justify the heathen through faith,' is one thing, and to make all men finally holy and happy, is another. Therefore Paul uses Gal. 3:8, in a sense very different from that in which you have heard it used this evening. The term 'heathen' in this text, seems to be synonymous with 'all nations.' But they are to be justified 'through faith,' that is conditionally. The passage is therefore against my opponent's views; for he does not believe that 'the blessings of life and immortality' are 'in any sense conditional.' As I firmly believe the promise to Abraham will be fulfilled at the time when 'the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea,' Isa. 11:9; as I have shown the fallacy of the argument for the 'absolute universality' of the Abrahamic promise, and as I do not believe 'that the gospel is a system of temporal blessings merely,' I need not reply to what has been said on this score. I will, however, show that Heb. 11:39:40, is unfortunately quoted on this subject. According to the use which has been made of this text, the 'worthies' here mentioned went to heaven, without being blessed in Christ. For if the promise to Abraham relates to 'life and immortality' in the future state, then it absolutely follows, either that those worthies have received that blessing, or else they have gone to heaven, or into unconsciousness, without receiving it. Therefore, unless my opponent believes in the 'sleepy doctrine,' or in Restorationism, he must see, that, according to his own views, the corrupt anti-debtarians, the licentious Sodomites, and all who have ever lived and died in the most heinous sins, have gone to heaven, where, with the ancient worthies, and all who have died in the Lord, they must wait to the end of time, for 'life and immortality;' or, in other words, for the fulfillment of the Abrahamic promise. I shall wait to see how he will clear himself from this absurdity.

That the promise not received by those who 'died in faith,' relates to nothing after death, is evident—1. From the fact that 'some BETTER thing' than those ancient saints received, was provided for the apostle and his brethren. Hence, unless there is something better than 'life and immortality,' this promise, or some better thing, was enjoyed in time. 2. Those who lived to see Christ, received something much better than those who desired to see him, but died without the sight. See Matt. 13:17. Thus it is seen that Paul and the believers of his day, had received the promise in the coming of the long desired Messiah; and that any better thing than this, not ~~to be~~ received by God's ancient servants, was provided for Paul or any one else, cannot be sustained, either by the Bible or reason.

The 'high authority' he quotes against the conditionality

of the promise to Abraham, consisting of extracts from my sermon on Isa. 25:8, comes from the reasoning of universalists against the future reference of texts which relate to punishment. Therefore, as ‘they must not now be allowed to back out of’ their ‘position,’ and ‘if they’ ‘are willing to abide by’ their ‘own propositions,’ Isa. 25:8, one of their strongest texts in the Old Testament, is effectually taken from their hands.

But as it has not been proved that the blessing promised to the patriarchs, is to be received in the immortal state; and as I have never argued that this promise is wholly conditional, all that was said on this part of the subject is as much out of place as were the arguments against the gospel being ‘a system of temporal blessings merely.’ I firmly believe that many blessings of a religious nature are unconditionally enjoyed wherever the gospel is preached. It should be remembered that when the promise was made, Idolatry pervaded the world. Therefore, as the gospel is to remove every system of image-worship, with all its heavy curses, the promise may be unconditionally fulfilled in time. The text in ‘2 Cor. 1:20,’ affords as much proof of this view of the subject, as it does of the view of my opponent. He has argued that ‘this promise is’ not ‘in any sense conditional,’ and I have admitted that there is a sense in which it is unconditionally to be fulfilled in time. But that it is unconditional as far as the personal holiness and happiness of one of the human family is concerned, I utterly deny. Paul says, in reference to this very promise, ‘so then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham. That the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe,—followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises. And so after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise. See Gal. 3:8, 9, 22. Heb. 6:12,15. Here faith, patience, and endurance, are named as conditions on which the promise is received! What now becomes of the assertion that ‘this promise is’ not ‘in any sense conditional?’ I think I have now fully answered all the arguments for the final holiness and happiness of all men, founded on this promise. I will however, offer some further reasons against my opponent’s views of this subject.

1. There is not one word said in any place where this promise is named, about a future state. And surely universalists, who have so often denied the future reference of texts which speak of punishment, on the ground of their not speaking of the immortal state of being, ought to feel the force of this statement.

2. If Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob knew any thing about the holiness and happiness of all men, hereafter, it is strange they never name it. If this hope was entertained by them, ‘why was it not expressed?’ What universalist can answer this

question without refuting an oft repeated objection against future punishment? In the days of the ancient worthies, men had their hopes and fears as they have now; they also lived and died as men do now. But no where do we find that they ever name universal future salvation, or even hint at that doctrine.

Quoting from A. C. Thomas, varying a few words so as to meet the case before us, 'I ask my opponent to quote a single passage from all that was communicated to Moses at Horeb, in which any thing like the final holiness and happiness of all men is so much as clearly intimated.' Theo. Dis. p. 55.

3. Nor is there a particle of proof in the Old Testament that they believed in the resurrection of the dead. There is nothing more said about this, than there is about the final holiness and happiness of all men, or the doctrines of transmigration, annihilation, or eternal damnation. And as universalists reject this last named doctrine because it is not named in the Old Testament, I shall reject the doctrine of the resurrection on the ground that it is not named by the patriarchs. 'Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau concerning things to come:' Heb. 11:20. But he did not intimate to them that there would be a resurrection of the dead. 'Joseph, when he died, made mention of the departing of the children of Israel; and gave commandment concerning his bones.' But he is as silent about a resurrection as Isaac is. And indeed the Old Testament nowhere mentions the resurrection of all mankind in the immortal state. It now remains for my opponent either to prove that this doctrine was believed by the patriarchs, or abandon the Abrahamic promise.

4. An attempt has been made to prove from the New Testament, that this promise refers to the future resurrection. But this is unfortunate for my opponent, as Messrs. Walter Balfour and A. C. Thomas have decided that the meaning of the New Testament is to be ascertained by the Old. Why then does he attempt to learn the meaning of the Old Testament from the New? Does he know better how to learn the meaning of the Old Testament than Dr. Campbell, Mr. Balfour, and Mr. Thomas do?

5. If the doctrine of the resurrection was known to the Old Testament saints, then, according to universalist reasoning against future punishment, it is not true that Christ brought life and immortality to light through the gospel. See, 2 Tim. 1:10.

These five arguments, based mostly on universalist reasoning, show that my opponent has yet much to do before he can make out his case.

6. He assumes that this promise is to be fulfilled in the immortal state. But what saith the word of God. 'And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was

made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again.' Acts 13:32, 33. Paul declares that God HATH FULFILLED the promise made to the fathers, in raising up Jesus from the dead. God hath fulfilled this promise, says Paul—He hath not, saith my opponent. The foregoing considerations show that the Abrahamic promise affords not a particle of proof of the final holiness and happiness of all men.

SIXTH AND SEVENTH EVENINGS.

Mr. B.'s rejoinder:—

My brother H. has argued that the ancient worthies knew nothing of the doctrine of the resurrection. To this I reply by quoting Luke 20:37. 'Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.' This text shows that the doctrine of the resurrection is taught in the Old Testament.*

I am sincerely obliged to him for bringing forward that passage in Acts xiii.; for if any thing was wanting to complete the argument from the promises, he has certainly supplied the last link in the chain. He says that the promise to Abraham, according to the apostle, was fulfilled in the resurrection of Christ. Granted. But how let me ask, were "all the nations, families, and kindreds of the earth" blessed in the resurrection of Christ? Paul shall answer—see 1 Cor. 15:20—22, and 42, 43. "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." "So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power." If to be made alive "in Christ," in "incorruption," "power," and "glory," be not final holiness and happiness, then it is difficult to find language to denote such a state. I desire no better portion for myself—I can ask nothing better for my fellow men, than that we should be raised at last in the condition described by the apostle. I am content to rest the argument here.

Mr. H.'s replication:—

1. In Luke 13:28, Christ says, 'ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out.' Now when my opponent

* Luke 20:37 and Mr. B.'s remarks on it, are left out of the universalist report of his part of the discussion; but they are inserted above, as near verbatim as I can recollect them. His arguments and my replies for one evening, and his denial of the future reference of John 5:29, and Heb. 6:2, are also omitted. The reader must conjecture the cause of these omissions.

E. H.

can show how the Jews saw the patriarchs and prophets this side of the immortal state, I can show that those worthies may exist in some sense, while their existence affords no proof of a resurrection in that state. Therefore Luke 20:37, affords no greater evidence of a future raising of the dead, than the text I have just quoted does of the Jews seeing Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of God, out of which they shall be thrust, in the future world.

2. He has taken the position that all mankind are to be made holy and happy in the resurrection, at which time the Abrahamic promise is to be fulfilled. Hence Eph. 1:10 should read, 'That in the dispensation of the fullness of times, He might raise from the dead all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him'!! Col. 1:20 should stand, 'By him to raise all things from the dead to himself: by him I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven.' 1 Tim. 2:4 should read, 'who will have all men to be raised from the dead, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.' Chapter 4, verse 10, ought to stand, —'God, who will raise all men from the dead, specially those that believe'!! I now deny that the wicked are to be made holy and happy at the resurrection. This point must be proved before the 15th chapter of 1 Corinthians, or any other text, can be made to prove the future reference of the Abrahamic promise. It is now seen that the arguments on this subject, which I presented last evening, remain wholly unanswered.

3. The argument for the final holiness and happiness of all men, now rests on '1 Cor. 15:20—22, and 42, 43.' By these texts my opponent attempts to prove that God will again fulfill the promise to Abraham by saving all men at the resurrection, notwithstanding he had fulfilled it to Paul and the Christians of his day, by raising up Christ from the dead. I might set this argument aside by stating that Paul means nothing more than that mankind will be raised *by* Christ, &c. The audience will see that the apostle omits the phrase holy and happy, which is the very language he ought to use to prove that the wicked will be raised in a state of felicity. But I need not dwell here, for in my first reply last evening, my arguments left a part of mankind in the lake of fire with death, the last enemy, after the resurrection. I also showed that after the destruction of the devil, his works, and hades, and after the dead are raised, there will be an eternal judgment. It was also shown that Paul in writing the fifteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians, did not intend to teach universalism. There has been no attempt to answer one of these arguments. Let it be understood that they must be disposed of before the passages on which my opponent now rests his argument, can give his cause the least support. He has, to be sure attempted to evade the force of part of them by deny-

ing the future reference of the resurrection to damnation, and the eternal judgment.* But I will meet him here by denying the future reference of the 15th chapter of 1 Corinthians. He should know that I have as much right to this course as he has. Mr. Whittemore calls this chapter the Magna Charta, or great charter of universalism, and my opponent rests his argument for the final holiness and happiness of all men on some passages in it. If it does unquestionably prove this doctrine, its future reference can easily be shown. The question before us does not require me to prove a future eternal judgment; but it does require him to prove that there will be a general resurrection; and this he must do or give up the Abrahamic promise, for he asserts that it will be fulfilled at that event. Now let him go to the Old Testament and show, if he can, that the resurrection of all mankind to a holy and happy state, is taught there. If he has read Mr. Balfour's Inquiries into the scriptural import of the words rendered hell, and devil; or if he recollects Mr. Whittemore's arguments on John 5:28, 29, and Heb. 6:2, he will dread his task. When he makes it appear that the resurrection named in these texts belongs to this state, I will prove by arguments equally as conclusive, that the resurrection in 1 Cor. 15th chapter, is not now future in its reference; for I am told that the word rendered resurrection in this chapter is the same as that in John and Hebrews. I now call on him to come up to this work, as a failure to prove that the resurrection in Corinthians refers to the immortal state will ruin his cause.† I will here remark, that I have freely quoted universalist authors in this discussion, because the advocates of universalism have made so many converts by quoting orthodox authors. I wish also to show this audience, particularly universalists, that this course carried out, inevitably leads to the doctrine of no future existence. I do not charge my opponent with this belief; but I must say in all sincerity, that universalist arguments against a future hell, when applied to salvation, heaven, and the resurrection, show as conclusively that man will not exist hereafter as they do that none will suffer after the resurrection. Perhaps some may think this course will tend to make some believe that there is

* This denial, as I have previously said, is left out of the universalist report of the discussion.

† Instead of attending to my request, Mr. B. *inquired* whether I would concede the argument if he would prove that the passages in John 5:28, 29, and Heb. 6:2, do not refer to a future state, by arguments that will not as conclusively prove that 1 Cor. 15 does not refer to a future state. As I then erroneously supposed that this issue would allow me to say all I wished to against the future reference of this chapter, I consented for him to take it. He probably took this advantage of my misapprehension because he saw that he could not attend to my request without meeting arguments similar to those used by universalists to prove that there is no future punishment. This shows that his cause was hopeless.

no hereafter. None, however, will be led to this conclusion but such as think that the reasoning of universalists against an eternal hell, and eternal judgment, is correct. And how they can avoid seeing that universalism tends to the doctrine of no existence beyond death, is strange to me. As the phrase, final holiness and happiness of all men, so often used by universalists, is not once named in the Bible, it is not strange that their highly sectarian and extremely bigoted writings make more converts to universalism than the writings of Christ and the apostles do. How many who had read the Bible for years, without once thinking it taught that doctrine, have become universalists by reading Ballou's Notes on the Parables, Balfour's Inquiries, Whittemore's Notes and Illustrations of the Parables, the Trumpet, the Lowell Tracts, or some kindred productions. This shows that their faith stands, not in the power of God, but in the wisdom of men.

Mr. B.'s reply:—

I take the issue presented by brother H.; and, that there be no mistake in regard to his proposition, I will repeat it. (The proposition was repeated, and Eld. H. signified that it was correct.) Let it be distinctly understood, then, that if I prove that the passages in John 5:28, 29, and Heb. vi., do not refer to the future state, by arguments that will not as conclusively prove that 1 Cor. xv. does not refer to a future state, brother H. is bound to concede the argument. I submit the following, then, as proof that the resurrection spoken of in John 5:29 does not refer to the future state:—

1. Our Savior declared in the immediate context, "The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." It is not universalists only, but Christ himself, that limits the resurrection to the present state, and the past tense. But where do we find this said of the resurrection spoken of in 1 Cor. xv.?

2. The passage in John does not refer to the resurrection of all men. It speaks only of those that are in their graves," and "that have done good" or "evil." But multitudes have been burnt, and their ashes scattered to the winds—multitudes of others have been devoured by wild beasts and cannibals, and perished in various ways, so as not properly to be "in their graves," and consequently are not included in this resurrection. Multitudes, such as infants and idiots, have done neither good nor evil, and consequently are not included in the text; so that it falls far short of a universal, or even a general resurrection. But can this be said of 1 Cor. xv., which declares that "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive"?

3. To construe this passage in John to relate to the final resurrection of all mankind, would be to place it in direct

opposition to what is taught in Luke 20.36—38. It has already been shown, in the argument on that passage, that all are to be raised "equal unto the angels of God in heaven." To be in a state of damnation is, agreeable to the popular understanding of that phrase, to be in a state of wickedness, and indescribable wretchedness. But is such the condition of angels, or any part of the angels of God in heaven? If not, and I trust my brother will not pretend that it is, then is his construction of the passage in John placed in a direct opposition to the words of our Savior, referred to in Luke. But can this be said of 1 Cor. xv., which declared, "So also is the resurrection from the dead," &c.? I might add other reasons why John 5:28,29, does not refer to the future state, but these I deem sufficient. It will be borne in mind that it is not my business, according to his proposition, to explain the passage, but only to show that it does not refer to the future state. And now I claim that he is bound to show that the several reasons that I have given why the passage in John does not refer to the future state, apply equally to the resurrection spoken of in Cor. or yield the argument.

As to the passage in Heb. 6:2, the following considerations may be urged as a reason why it cannot refer to the future state. It may well be doubted whether the principles of proper Christianity are at all in the passages, and for reasons which will be obvious from reading it in its proper connection, as follows: "Therefore, leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith towards God, of the doctrine of baptism, and of laying on of hands* and eternal judgment, and this will we do if God permit." Now is it probable that the apostle would exhort believers to leave the genuine principles and doctrines of Christianity in order to go on unto perfection? We think not. We think they would rather adhere to such principles. The probability is, therefore, that the several doctrines here enumerated were certain tenets of the Judaizing Christians, that were not essential to Christianity, and they were to leave them in order to become perfect in the Christian faith. But my brother H. instead of heeding the apostolic exhortation to leave these doctrines, seems determined to stick to them, Judaism and all.

It may be observed, also, that this is the only place in the scriptures where an *eternal judgment* is spoken of. The general judgment commonly believed in by professing Christians, is to occupy but a limited space in duration, and to be succeeded by retribution. But it will be perceived at once,

* By whom the phrase 'resurrection of the dead,' was here left out, and whether the omission was inadvertent or intentional, I cannot say. It is a singular instance of sheer carelessness or deliberate wickedness.

that an eternal judgment is quite a different affair; and if this eternal judgment is to stand in place of the commonly talked of general judgment, then endless misery must be a fable; for there certainly cannot be space left, after an eternal judgment, to inflict it.

Pierree, an eminent parisian commentator, concludes a somewhat lengthy exposition of this passage thus—I think, therefore, that the words are to be understood in a very different manner, and *krima* here seems to me to be put for temporal judgments. Thus the word is used 1 Pet. 4:17, *The time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God*, where the context will not suffice us to take it in any other sense; Comp. ver. 16, 18, 19. So again 1 Cor. 11:29, *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the Lord's body*. What this judgment was appears from the next verse—*For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep*. See also verse 34. The word *aionios*, which we have rendered *eternal*, I take to respect not the time to come, but the time past, and to signify *ancient or past long ago*. That the word is thus used without any respect to eternity, we may see, Rom. 16:25, 2 Tim. 1:9, Tit. 1:2. See also these places in the LXX. Psalm 77:5. Prov. 22:28. Jer. 18:15. Ezek. 36:2. According to this account of the words, we may consider the Jewish religion as established by the ancient and tremendous judgments of the execution of which the books of Moses give an account—such as the deluge, the destruction of *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*, and more especially the drowning of *Pharaoh* and his host in the Red Sea, and perhaps the judgments of God upon the *Israelites* in the wilderness for their iniquity and unbelief. (See Paige's selections, p. 253.)

I now call on my brother to apply the reasons for not referring these passages to the future state, to the resurrection spoken of in Corinthians, or redeem his pledge, by conceding that I have established the affirmative of the question.

Reply of Mr. H.

If the arguments we have just heard against the future reference of John 5:28, 29, and Heb. 6:2, are conclusive, they go far towards confining the resurrection mentioned in 1 Cor. 15th chapter, to this state; for, as I have already said, in the original the word rendered resurrection is of the same import in all these places. But before I attend to this matter, I will show that the reasoning you have just heard is not correct. That the resurrection to damnation mentioned in John 5:29, belongs to the future state the following arguments will show.

1. In verse 25, our Lord assured his hearers that even then the dead should hear his voice and live, which it seems caused them to wonder. But in verses 28, 29, he told them

In substance, not to marvel at what he had just said, for the time was coming when he would raise the dead and judge them. Whether verse 25 refers to the spiritually dead who were about to hear and believe Christ's doctrine, or to some who were about to be literally raised from the dead, as the widow's son, is of no consequence. In either case the view I have given of the Savior's meaning, avoids the repetition which the universalist view of this subject puts into his address. The assertion that 'multitudes,' including 'infants and idiots,' are 'not included in the text,' is mere assertion, and therefore it proves nothing. I shall soon show that the ascension of the saints to heaven is 'not included in the' account of the resurrection in the 15th of 1 Cor.; and also that this omission proves that that resurrection is limited 'to the present state, and the past tense.' And when my opponent proves by John 5:28, 29, that multitudes are not included in the resurrection there named, I will prove from 1 Cor. 15, that those who are included in that account of the resurrection, will not ascend to heaven.

As it has already been shown in reply to the argument on Luke 20:36—38, that to be 'equal to the angels of God in heaven,' signifies only that those who will be raised from the dead cannot die any more, the remarks on this score need no reply.

2. That John 5:25, 29, and Heb. 6:2, are now future in their reference, we learn from Acts 24:15, where Paul says he has hope towards God, that is confidence in Him, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust, which, he asserts, the Pharisees allowed, that is admitted. As Mr. Balfour owns, 2d Inq. pp. 88, 89, that the Jews in our Lord's day, believed that but few would be saved, it follows, as they admitted the resurrection in which Paul had confidence, that he believed the unjust would be raised in an unholy state hereafter. The fact that 'infants and idiots' are never called either just or unjust in the Bible, goes as far to prove that they are left out of this resurrection, as my opponent's assertion does to prove that they are left out of the resurrection in John 5:29.

3. His own reasoning shows that this text refers to the future state. He contends that the spiritually dead, and a spiritual resurrection only, are here intended. The learned Whitby, who is often quoted by universalists, has shown that all who are in a state of sin, 'particularly' the 'heathens,' are considered as dead and in their graves in the sense of this passage. See Paige's Selections, pp. 177, 178. It has also been said in this discussion, that 'all' dont mean part,* that 'every creature,' and 'all nations,' &c. are 'universal' in their meaning. Admitting the correctness of this reasoning,

* This statement Mr. B. made in one of his arguments; but it was left out when the argument was published.

it follows that the multitudes of dead ~~saints~~ who do not hear the voice of the Savior and come forth from their spiritual graves to the resurrection of damnation in time, will inevitably come forth to this condemnation in the immortal state!!! 'The only alternative that is left is to admit this, or to conclude that Christ uttered a falsehood.' Where now is the assertion that 'It is not universalists only, but Christ himself, that limits the resurrection [in John 5:28, 29] to the present state, and the past tense?'

4. 'As it respects the passage in Heb. 6:2,' the remarks in relation to 'the principles of proper Christianity' may pass for what they are worth, as they have nothing to do with the doctrine of eternal judgment, which Paul places AFTER the 'resurrection of the dead.'

5. In relation to the argument against a future eternal judgment, it is enough to reply, If his views are 'to stand in the place of the commonly talked of' final holiness and happiness of all men, then universalism 'must be a fable; for there certainly cannot be space left, after' 'eternal damnation,' to save those who suffer it! 'The text, however, means that the decision of the Judge will be eternal, and not that He will be forever making that decision.'

6. The solitary opinion of Mr. Pierce against the views of the almost entire christian world, respecting the meaning of a text so obviously future in its reference, needs not to be noticed.

I now proceed to show, by arguments which are as conclusive as those used by universalists to limit texts relating to punishment wholly to this life, that 1 Cor. xv., on which my opponent's cause now depends, has no reference to an immortal resurrection.

1. It has already been shown by universalist reasoning, in reply to the arguments on Luke 20:34—36, that the word rendered resurrection, does not necessarily mean a literal rising from the dead. As far then as the meaning of the word is concerned, there is nothing in this chapter to prove a literal resurrection of any part of mankind.

2. My opponent has just made it appear in his way, that the resurrection in John and Hebrews, is in 'the present state, and the past tense.' Then 'to construe the passages in' 1 Cor. xv., 'to relate to the final resurrection of all mankind, would be to place them in direct opposition to what is taught in' John 5:28, 29, and Heb. 6:2.

3. He has argued that the resurrection of the dead, named in Heb. 6:2, is not a principle 'of proper Christianity.' Why then should he 'stick to' this net 'of the Judaizing Christians' at all? If punishment was named in connection with the resurrection in 1 Cor., he could limit the whole chapter to this life as easily as he now does all those texts which speak of misery at the resurrection. When he shows how

ALL the spiritually dead hear Christ's voice and come forth in this life, I will show how **ALL** that die in Adam are made alive in him, in this state.

4. I have shown already in this discussion, that the Old Testament saints knew nothing of the resurrection of all men to a state of holiness and happiness. And this goes as far to prove that there is no future resurrection, as their ignorance of future punishment goes to prove that there is no future misery.

5. The Old Testament usage of the resurrection shows that 1 Cor. xv., relates only to this life; for that book says no more about a general resurrection in the immortal state than it does about a general judgment after the resurrection. Mr. Balfour, 1st Inq. pp. 114, 115, admits that it is from 'the Old Testament' "*that we must learn, both what the principal facts, customs, doctrines, and precepts are, that are alluded to in the apostolical writings, and what is the proper signification and extent of the expressions used.*"—Let us then have recourse to the Old Testament, to learn the signification and extent of Gehenna in the New.' According to this sentiment, which Mr. B. takes from Dr. Campbell, and which is avowed by Mr. A. C. Thomas, Theo. Dis. pp. 132, 133, 179, 180, 181, 182, it must be made evident that the future resurrection of all mankind is a 'doctrine' of the Old Testament, before 1 Cor. xv. can be made to support such a sentiment.*

6. The doctrine of a general resurrection is not taught in the book of Job, which Mr. Balfour says, 1st Inq. p. 340, 'is the oldest book in the world.' True Job says something about his Redeemer being alive, about seeing God in his flesh, &c. Chap. 19:25—27. But here is no intimation that any one besides himself would be interested in this matter. And Dr. Kennicutt, who, Mr. Balfour says, was 'the greatest Hebrew scholar of his day,' has shown that Job had no reference to a future existence; but to the time when God, whom he afterward saw, (see Chap. 42:5,) would vindicate his cause, and redeem him from his troubles. See Dr. A. Clarke on Job. 19:25—27, where he says, 'Any attempt to establish the *true meaning* of this passage is almost hopeless.'

7. The texts in the prophets relating to a resurrection, are evidently figurative. See Dan. 12:2, which comes nearer the description of a general resurrection than any other passage in the Old Testament, for example. If this text is figurative and belongs to this state, where can we find one in the law or the prophets, which denotes a general resurrection of the literally dead?

* The reader who wishes to see a powerful universalist argument against a future judgment applied to the resurrection, may turn back to p. 35—37 of this work.

8. Dr. Clarke says, comment on John 11:24, 'The Jewish writings after the captivity are full of this doctrine, [the resurrection of the dead.] See 2 Macc. 7:9,' &c. According to Mr. Balfour's reasoning from pp. 85 to 93 of his 2d Inq. this doctrine is not taught in the writings of the Jews, but is a heathenish notion brought back from their captivity. Because the doctrines of Evil spirits, Hell, that few should be saved, Immediate punishment after death, the Day of Judgment, the endless duration of future punishment, are taught in the Apocryphal writings of the Jews, Mr. B. infers that these tenets are all of heathen origin, and were adopted by the Jews during their captivity. Why did he not show his readers where the general resurrection is taught in the Bible before the captivity, or else set this doctrine down as a heathen fable with other sentiments of this character? As he neglected to do this in his inquiry, I will do it here for him.

9. It is now seen that this doctrine is not taught in the writings of the Old Testament. And Christ said nothing which implies a more general resurrection than his remarks in John 5:28, 29, intimate; but as they relate only to this state, it follows that he never taught that all mankind shall be raised in an immortal state.*

10. Martha said that her brother would rise again in the resurrection at the last day. John 11:24. The Jews then believed the dead would be raised at the last day, at which time Christ said he would raise up, and also judge mankind. See John 6:39, 40, 44, 54; 12:48. These passages prove that the resurrection is not in the immortal state; for according to universalism, there is no 'last day,' nor judgment there.

11. In Paul's time, some said that the resurrection had passed already. See 2 Tim. 2:18. As this assertion overthrew 'the faith of some,' it affords strong presumptive evidence that an immortal resurrection was not expected in the apostles' days.

12. Paul wished to 'ATTAIN unto the resurrection of the dead.' Phil. 3:11. Who does not see the folly of making an effort to be literally raised from the dead? This text shows that the apostle expected no such resurrection.

13. He hoped for, that is expected or had confidence in,

* Here, as near as I can recollect, the moderator decided that my arguments were not to the point; and, considering the use my opponent had made of the issue he had obtained from me, the decision was probably correct. During my remarks at this time, I was often interrupted by Mr. B., on account of which the moderator once called him to order, some hissed at him, and others left the house. The next evening I resumed my arguments *in order*, and finished what I had to say against the future reference of 1 Cor. xv., to which no reply was made. I hoped there would be a reply so that I might see how the reasoning I used against a future resurrection could be fairly met by universalists without overthrowing some of their most conclusive arguments against future punishment.

a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust; a resurrection which the Pharisees also allowed or admitted. Acts 24:15. But this cannot mean mankind universally; for infants and idiots, large portions of the human race, are never called just or unjust by the sacred writers. Farther; the Pharisees did not believe that the unjust would be raised in a holy state. This resurrection, then, is the same as the resurrection to life, and the resurrection to damnation, named by our Lord in John 5:28, 29. Consequently it has nothing to do with a future state.

14. At ‘the resurrection of the dead,’ described at length in 1 Cor. 15, and on which my opponent’s argument for the final holiness and happiness of all men now wholly rests, Christ is to come. V. 23, they that are Christ’s at his coming. To determine when this resurrection takes place, we must learn when Christ came. On this point the testimony of distinguished universalist authors is explicit. In remarking on 1 Thess. 1:6—10, Mr. A. C. Thomas says, “The time specified by the apostle is, ‘when he shall come;’ when the Lord Jesus shall be *revealed* from heaven.’ I have already shown when Jesus was to *come*, viz. before the close of the generation in which he lived. No doubt Paul’s language when written, had a future reference—but I cannot allow you to assume that it is *yet* future.” See Theo. Dis. p. 82. The same author remarks, “James, addressing the Christians among the twelve tribes scattered abroad says, ‘Be patient, therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. . . . *The coming of the Lord draweth nigh,*’ James 5:7, 8.” Vide Confutation of Miller’s Theory, p. 18. Mr. Whittemore testifies, Univ. Guide, p. 125, “Here [Mat. 16:28] it is evident, beyond possibility of mistake, that the coming of the Son of man was to take place during the natural lives of some of those who stood near him, at the time he uttered these words.” According to these testimonies, the ‘COMING’ of Christ drew nigh in James’s day, and he came before the close of the generation in which he lived; therefore we may now say in truth, The resurrection is passed already, and those who ‘assume that it is yet future’ should be classed with those bigots and fanatics who ignorantly suppose the coming of Christ relates to a day of future judgment.

15. At the resurrection under consideration, the end is to come. Verse 24, Then cometh the end. I will now show you that the end came nearly 2000 years ago. Peter declared in his day, The end of all things is at hand, 1 Pet. 4:7. As the end named in Cor. must be the end of some *thing*, it follows from Peter’s testimony, that that end was at hand in his day. It could not therefore have reference to a resurrection yet to take place in the immortal state. He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved—Then shall the end come. Mat. 24:13, 14. On this last text Mr. Bal-

four remarks, 2d Inq. p. 318, 'What end should come? Evidently the end of the Jewish age, verse 3, which took place about forty years after our Lord delivered this discourse. Mr. Thomas says, Theo. Dis. p. 148, 'Who can avoid perceiving that all these things, including *the end* spoken of, were to transpire at the destruction of Jerusalem?' Thus the Savior, Peter, and Messrs. Balfour and Thomas, two eminent universalist ministers, unitedly testify that the *end* came long ago; and consequently the resurrection with which it is connected, 'is not an event now future.'

16. Some to whom the apostle wrote were to be alive at the resurrection. See verses 51, 52, and 1 Thess. 4:15. WE shall not all sleep, but we shall be changed—WE which are alive and REMAIN unto the coming of the Lord,' &c. James, as I have already stated, asserted in his day, that the coming of the Lord drew nigh, and Paul here talks of being alive and remaining unto that coming. This proves as positively that the resurrection took place centuries ago, as what our Savior says in Mat. 16:27, 28, proves that the judgment named in chap. xxv. verses 31—46, occurred at the destruction of Jerusalem.

17. At this resurrection the trumpet sounds. Verse 52. At the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound. By reference to Mat. 24:31, we learn that this took place at the coming of the Son of man to destroy Jerusalem.

18. It is not said here that those who are raised are to go into heaven. This omission proves as conclusively that an immortal resurrection is not intended, as the omission to mention the unholy resurrection of the wicked proves that they will be raised holy and happy, although this doctrine is not asserted in the Bible.

19. At the resurrection before us, death and hades are destroyed. Verses 54, 55. Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? By reference to Rev. 20:2—15, we learn that, at a GENERAL RESURRECTION there named, the dead were judged, and death and hades were cast into the lake of fire. But that this has no reference to a future state, we learn from the fact that some of the human race were cast into this lake with them. Now till it is shown that the death and hades in Rev. are distinct from those in Cor., it follows unavoidably that the resurrection described by Paul took place long ago, death lost its sting long since, and the grave or hades was despoiled of its victory centuries before we had our being.

Although I called on my opponent to prove the future reference of '1 Cor. xv.' and told him it would ruin his cause to neglect this matter, he has paid no attention to it. As the case now stands the foundation on which he based his argument is entirely destroyed, and thus the negative of the question under discussion is proved. It is not only manifest that

universalism is not true, but that the same kind of arguments which are constantly used to prove that doctrine, prove with equal conclusiveness that there is no future resurrection—no future existence. Thus, in attempting to clear himself from John 5:28, 29, &c. by denying the future reference of these texts, and then resting his argument on 1 Cor. xv., he has effectually opened the way for me to show the doctrinal tendency of universalism, a work which I hoped to be able to do when I accepted his challenge. I now solemnly ask this audience, Who will risk their own eternal interests, or feel easy to see their friends risking theirs, on a doctrine not once named in the Bible, and which necessarily tends to the sentiment that men will not exist hereafter?

During the discussion our sympathies have been appealed to by the representation that some of our friends are probably lost if universalism is not true. Remember, I beseech you, that believing this doctrine will not change the state of the dead. But, as you have some influence, your believing it, and giving your influence in its favor, may induce some to neglect repentance; and should they die unreconciled to God—in their sins, you may fear after they are gone, that your course was one means of this dreadful result. There is an awful probability that universalism is not true; and as the impenitent wish to think that their sins will not be visited on them hereafter, and as many when dying have renounced this doctrine, there is great danger in resting our future hopes upon it. But there is not, there cannot be any danger in rejecting it.

After a discussion of seven evenings, I have to inform you that not one text can be found which names the final holiness and happiness of all men. Hence, according to Mr. Balfour's remarks on 'an eternal hell,' which I quoted at the commencement of this debate, 'such language is coined at the mint of modern divinity, and may be a very good plan for increasing a sect, but this is a very different thing from making men Christians.'

APPENDIX.

The arguments on both sides of the question were briefly recapitulated at the close of the discussion. But as Mr. B. did not publish his recapitulation, I have omitted mine. The moderator, is entitled to many thanks for the able and impartial manner in which he presided during the debate, and the large audience for their decorum, candor, and good attention.

In the Universalist Palladium of Nov. 20, 1841, it is asserted that, as I failed 'to say any thing, in fact, that related to the point at issue, it was concluded that no good could be answered by a farther continuance of the debate, under such circumstances. The moderator, therefore, assumed the responsibility of declaring the debate at an end.' That the moderator closed the controversy for the cause here assigned, any more than he did because Mr. B. who led in the discussion, failed to give any new light on 'the point at issue,' I utterly deny, 'and challenge the proof.' As the arguments on both sides are now before the public, the candid will decide whether there was any reason for closing the debate because I was not able to meet the arguments of my opponent. The evening before the controversy was ended, he said it should go on till doom's day; and despite of what the moderator or any one else could have done to prevent it, according to the rules of discussion which Mr. B. wrote himself, the arguments might have been continued till that time, unless either he or myself had signified a wish to proceed no farther!

When I concluded to publish this pamphlet I designed to expose about one hundred misrepresentations and perversions which Messrs. Gibbs, Bulkeley, Williams, Stevens, and Burr, have penned respecting myself and the discussion. The first of these gentlemen is editor of the Dover Gazette, and one of the principal supporters of the universalist Society in Dover. The others are universalist ministers. I also intended to give large specimens of the courtesy and scurility of universalists. But as it is well known that most of those who oppose their doctrine, are slandered, ridiculed and contemned, I have concluded to omit this work at present, as such conduct towards their opponents, seems to be the natural fruit of the sentiment that a man cannot commit sin

enough to cause him any punishment that will not be for his good. Mr Ballou says, Nine Sermons, p. 34, ‘Love to some and hatred to others, is the peculiar character of all the *doctrines* which the partial wisdom of men has ever *invented*.’ This probably explains the cause of the ‘hatred’ of universalists towards ‘the orthodox,’ and especially towards those who renounce universalism. This disposition is so common and so obvious among them, that the ‘Old Colony Conference’ of universalists have, for some cause, thought best to rebuke it in the following manner. ‘Resolved, That the practice of praising indiscriminately all those who leave the ranks of our opponents, and come over to us, while they are with us—and censuring as indiscriminately those who happen to leave us, is, in our opinion, unwise, and ought to be immediately abandoned.’ See Trumpet of Dec. 5, 1840. As this sect seem to think that God has made them His favorites by revealing the truth to them, while He wills others to believe an ‘awful,’ a ‘horrible,’ ‘blasphemous,’ lie, it is not strange that they ‘love’ those to whom He is so partial. Nor is it singular that they feel at liberty to abuse such as the counsel of His will dooms to the misfortune and dishonor of disbelieving His glorious truth.

The sectarian desperation of universalists, is manifest in the following extracts. “We have no doubt, should we find, on arriving at our Father’s house, that one child of the vast family of man is absent from the ‘feast of immortal delights,’ we should fly quickly back on the wings of love, and seek and bring him up to the bright and shining courts of heaven, before we could join in that new song, sung by the 144,000 around the throne of God.” See Trumpet of March 17, 1838, last p.

In the Universalist Palladium of July 17, 1841, ‘M. B.’ supposed to be the universalist minister in Portsmouth, writes thus: ‘If it [endless misery] be true, (heaven pardon the blasphemy of the thought!) I wish not to know it now. Such knowledge cannot alter my condition for the better in this world or hereafter. It never could make me love mankind more; and as for its increasing my love or veneration for God, it certainly could not. If I must ever believe it, then, let the day be as far distant as possible. Let me live on in my present faith, trusting and happy, till the dread realities of eternity force the poisonous convictions upon me.’

Look, reader, at the desperation of these men. They virtually declare that if God will not save all men they will—if their doctrine is false, the truth will do them no good, and they wish to ‘believe a lie’ as long as they can!!! What hope is there of the conversion of such bigoted sectarians, and what will they not do to support their creed? Who can wonder at their misrepresenting and aspersing their opponents? Who can refrain from grieving to see his fellow

men setting under the ministry of such men? Who can believe what they say when their peculiar sentiments are concerned, and who can expect fair and honorable treatment at their hands, when he deals with them in matters relating to their sectarian interests? Let the abuse I have received from them, and shall still receive, let their numerous misrepresentations, thirty one of which I have heretofore exposed, answer some of these questions. Let it also answer the question, Why do so many ministers refuse to hold discussions with universalists? Since the above was written, one of the editors of the Universalist Palladium, has written several contemptuous articles against my humble self, calling me a 'blood hound,' saying that I have had a ring put upon my neck, commands me to 'make' my 'bow, and speak out of the other side of my 'mouth,' &c. This, and much more equally undignified, and ungentlemanly, seems to be the kind of intellectual food required by the taste of the Universalist community. Those who write in this style, have sunk themselves into a state into which I have no disposition to descend. I therefore readily yield the palm to them, and shall make no attempt at replying to such scurrility. When I read from the pens of some of their most popular writers, such sentences as the following, viz.—'Gospel porringer,' a porringer in a state of collapse, brought on by a six week's dysentery, that intolerable old porringer, and much more equally foolish, ludicrous, and nonsensical, I am astonished that those who write in this manner, claim to be the ministers of Jesus Christ. That his precepts and example countenance any thing of this silly nature, no one will assert. The fact that such articles are often found in universalist papers, is an insult to the intelligence, the taste, and the piety of their readers; for their insertion implies that they approve of that which is opposed to the grave, the holy, and the dignified style of Christ and the apostles. Who can believe that Paul and the other apostles would write such low and vulgar pieces for the press, were they now alive? It is hoped that these remarks will have a tendency to induce some who may read the writings of those implicated, to inquire, Can that be the religion of Christ which tolerates such levity, aspersions, and abuse as are often seen in universalist papers? Can such communications improve the minds or promote the morals of those who read them? Do they tend to promote the spirit of piety, benevolence, and good will among men? It is desired that this subject may be attended to with an interest corresponding to its importance. Those who wish to see the remarks on the gospel porringer, may read the Universalist Palladium, Vol. 3. No. 24.

As the printer informs me that more copy is needed in order to make out the last form of this work, the following ar-

ticles are inserted, with a design to show the fallacy of the doctrine which virtually asserts that man cannot sin enough to endanger his immortal interests. It is well known that universalists are almost constantly endeavoring to sustain their dogma by commenting on texts which are thought to be against their views; and it is hoped that the remarks on those that follow, will enable some to see how awfully uncertain is the hope of those who live and die in sins of deepest dye.

“THE LAKE OF FIRE.”

Under this caption, the Trumpet of Dec. 8, 1838, publishes an article on Rev. 20:12—15, copied from a universalist paper in the state of New York. The text reads as follows: “And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God: and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is *the book* of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.”

After a roundabout comparison of these verses with several *irrelevant* passages in order to prove that the ‘judgment’ here mentioned, ‘commenced with the destruction of Jerusalem,’ the writer proceeds to show what he wishes his readers ‘to understand by the Lake of Fire.’ By comparing the text with Isa. 34:8—17, he comes to the monstrous conclusion that the Lake of Fire named above, is ‘the land of Judea and its ill fated, miserable children, our Hebrew brethren yet in unbelief!’ Surely the exclamation point was never used more appropriately, than it is used at the close of this sentence. To the above sentiment I conscientiously object for the following reasons. 1. I can see no sense in supposing that those Jews who died in their own land at the destruction of Jerusalem, or those who remained there after that dreadful event, or those who died in a foreign captivity, were ‘CAST INTO’ the ‘land of Judea.’ On what grounds, I ask, can this opinion be sustained? I cannot understand how those Hebrews who were ‘reduced to beggary and want and DRIVEN FORTH TO EXILE,’ were in any sense cast into the Lake of Fire, if Palestine is that Lake. To me it seems as consistent to say that the Indians of Florida who have been killed in the late war, those who are reduced to beggary and want on the soil of their fathers, and those who have been removed by our Government west of the Mississippi, are ‘cast into the’ territory of Florida, as it is to say that the Jews in their misery at home and distress abroad, were cast into the land of Judea. 2. In Rev. 20:12—15, it is said that ‘the

sea,' 'death, and hell, delivered up the dead which were in them.' That any thing of this kind took place when Jerusalem was destroyed, there is not a particle of proof. Farther: it is said in this passage, that 'death and hell were cast into the Lake of Fire,' that is, according to the universalist exposition of the text, into the land of Judea, with the beast and false prophet. See verses 10, 14. 3. It is said in chapter 21, verse 8, that 'idolaters' shall have their part in this lake. Hence, as the Jews were not idolaters when their city was destroyed, and as the gentiles were not cast into the land of Judea at that time, it necessarily follows that this land is not the Lake of Fire. 4. The writer in question seems to be sensible that many of his readers, however they might wish his explanation of this passage correct, would see the fallacy of his reasoning. He therefore calls to his aid the incredible, unauthentic accounts of ignorant, superstitious monks to assist him in explaining a text which obviously overthrows his unsound and delusive theory. Here are his own words— "As the plain where Sodom and Gomorrah stood, continued to burn until A. D. 130 to 150—having burned nearly 2000 years—it is very probable that the Revelator referred to it by 'the Lake of Fire,' as well as to the language quoted from Isaiah." The writer referred to first takes the ground that we must understand this Lake *figuratively*; but seeming to have no confidence in this sentiment himself, or supposing that his readers would easily detect his fallacy, he next assumes that it is the land of Sodom and Gomorrah, which burnt nearly 2000 years after its cities were destroyed with fire and brimstone from heaven. Thus he changes his ground, and makes the Revelator speak of a *literal* Lake of Fire! Those who will read Rev. 20:10, 12—15; and 21:8, will see at once the absurdity of this explanation, of the text under consideration, for they will inquire, How were the devil, the beast, the false prophet, death, hell, idolaters, &c. cast into the land of Sodom while it was a burning lake? Farther: there is no evidence that this land was a lake of fire nearly 2000 years, after which it became a lake of water. Any man who can trifl with the Bible in this manner, must be wretchedly ignorant, or very wicked! 5. In relation to the passage in Isaiah, it may be remarked, that the chapter affords evidence that the land of Idumea or Edom is intended by the prophet. Vide verses, 6, 9, &c. But neither the text or the context in Rev. 20:12—15, affords any evidence that this or any other land is intended by John. O how awful will be the account which God will require of those who thus wrest the scriptures to their own destruction, and, it is to be feared, to the eternal ruin of those who receive their perversions of such texts as correct expositions of the word of God. My arguments in the preceding discussion, were used to show that those who labor so hard to con-

fine texts relating to punishment wholly to this state, ought, in order to be consistent with their expositions of such passages, to confine all the texts in the Bible to this state of existence!

PROF. THOLUCK AGAINST REV. A. C. THOMAS.

Mr. Thomas is one of the greatest universalist ministers in this country, and Dr. Tholuck is professor of theology in the university of Halle, in Germany. He is considered one of the greatest scholars and theologians in Europe. In his 'Theological Dis. with Dr. Ely, p. 236, Mr. Thomas reiterates a declaration "that mankind will be rendered happy hereafter by being *made alive in Christ, in incorruption, power, glory,*" &c. All who have read the 'Lowell Discussion,' know he argues that all mankind will be made holy and happy at the resurrection of the dead! Dr. Chauncey, a distinguished universalist author, professor Tholuck, 'the learned world,' and the common sense of mankind in general, are against his strange views of universal salvation at the resurrection. Fearful odds! On John 5:28, 29, professor T. says, that "this" phrase, "*hear the voice,* is a different one from v. 25, is obvious from the word *all*. Were this passage likewise referred to the spiritual resurrection, it would be necessary to have recourse to unnatural allegories. *Voice*, when used in reference to the resurrection, is a usual image for the life-giving agency of God; hence in other cases, *the voice of the trumpet, 1 Cor. 15:52.*" &c. The words in Greek are omitted in this quotation; but that Tholuck's views of the resurrection in the text before me, are not misrepresented by this omission, may be seen by consulting his Commentary on the Gospel of St. John, p. 149. He considers that this resurrection is not "spiritual," but "physical" like that in 1 Cor. 15:52. Hence his opinion sustains the Bible doctrine that the wicked are to be raised in a state 'of damnation,' a sentiment to which Mr. Thomas is opposed. Although some of the ignorant may think that professor T. does not understand the meaning of this text so well as Mr. T. does, he will not say that he knows more about its meaning than that great theologian does. The fact that universalists formerly attempted to make it appear that he held their views of the final holiness and happiness of all men, adds greatly to the force of these remarks!

But neither the opinions of great men, nor those of the world at large, against Mr. Thomas's views, are solely relied on as conclusive evidence in this momentous case. Admit what every intelligent man who has candidly considered this subject, knows is true, viz., that the Jews were not universalists, and the question is decided in Acts 24:15, by the testimony of the apostle Paul. He here declares that he has

"hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." The obvious meaning of the text is as follows, viz. I have *confidence* toward God that the just and unjust will be raised from the dead, a doctrine which is *admitted* by my accusers. Hence, if there is any truth in his declaration before Felix, his belief respecting the resurrection corresponds with the faith of 'the high priest' and 'elders,' on this subject. Compare Acts 24:1, 13—15. Therefore the doctrine that ALL mankind will be 'rendered' happy hereafter by being *made alive in Christ*, is an anti-scriptural dogma; and consequently the expectation of the wicked, based on a resurrection salvation, shall *perish*.

What has been said in this article, shows that all the reasoning of universalists on Luke 20:35, 39; and Rom. 8:21, is mere sophistry, and calculated therefore to deceive those who cannot detect the fallacy of their arguments.

ILLUSTRATION OF ISAIAH XLV. 23—25.

"I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Surely shall one say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength: even to him shall men come, and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed. In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified and shall glory."

This passage occupies a conspicuous place among the perverted texts with which universalists attempt to sustain their doctrine. It is said that 'this passage furnishes plain testimony' that 'righteousness is to become universal;' and that 'the sure promise of God, accompanied by his oath, remains for the destruction of sin.'

The meaning they give the text, is, simply, that ultimately 'every knee shall bow, and every tongue swear that in him [God] they have *righteousness and strength*;' or, in other words, that all mankind shall be saved.

The following arguments will show that this sentiment is not contained in Isa. 45:23—25.

1. There is no evidence that the *bowing* and *swearing* here mentioned, imply the holiness and happiness of all those to whom these terms are applied. The captains of Joshua's army put their feet on the necks of five Canaanitish kings. Josh. 10:24. But these kings, we are told in the 26th verse, were slain. Christ is to reign till he puts all enemies under his feet. 1 Cor. 15:25. But 'death' and 'the devil' are not, by this act, to be subjected to a *happy* obedience to his government. At his name every knee shall bow, in heaven and earth; and every tongue shall confess that he is Lord, to the glory of God. But it does not seem that any thing more is

intended here, than, that, however humble Christ appeared on earth, and however his authority was despised after his ascension, yet in due time, he shall be acknowledged as the governor of the universe. See Phil. 2:7—11.

2. According to the reasoning of universalists on future punishment, Isa. 45:23—25, affords no help to their cause. ‘I ask you to quote a simple passage from all that was communicated to Moses at Horeb, in which any thing like’ the future salvation of all men ‘is so much as clearly intimated.’ Theo. Dis. p. 55. “I ask you to cite a single passage from either Moses or the prophets, in which there is any intimation of the future endless” happiness of all the human race. “Dr. GEO. CAMPBELL says, ‘It is plain that, in the Old Testament, *the most profound silence* is observed in regard to the state of the deceased, their joys or sorrows, their happiness or misery.’ Dr. JAHN confirms this statement—for he says, ‘We have not authority decidedly to say, that any other motives were held out to the ancient Hebrews to pursue the good and avoid the evil, than those which were derived from *the rewards and punishments of this life.*’ In view of” the universalist exposition of the text “before us, I ask how” it can be that Isaiah said any thing “in relation to” the future unending felicity of all men, “concerning which Moses and the prophets observe the most profound silence?” Idem. p. 213.

3. The text does not say that ‘every knee shall bow and *every tongue* shall swear that in the Lord they have *righteousness and strength*,’ as the universalist minister in South Reading, Mass. would read it.* Look at the passage as it stands in the Bible, or read it at the head of this article, and you will see that my statement is correct. That every knee will bow, and every tongue confess in some sense, is not disputed. But to say, that it will be in the universalist sense, is sheer ASSUMPTION. Let us read again part of the text. ‘Surely, shall one say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength.’ Verse 24. Mark it reader; no commentator explains this verse as it is explained by universalists! In translating this text, after the words, ‘Surely shall,’ the translators supplied the word, ‘one,’ by which the passage is made to read, ‘Surely shall ONE say,’ &c. But the marginal reading is, ‘Surely HE shall say of me, In the LORD is all righteousness and strength.’ The Manuscripts and Versions, render some words in this verse differently, which shows that it is, to say the least, ambiguous. See Dr. A. Clarke on the place. Of this verse the Dr. says, ‘Probably these are the words of Cyrus, who acknowledged that all his success came from Jehovah.’ And the first part of this chapter, the *marginal reading* given above, and the proclamation of this king in Ezra 1:2, all unite to sustain this opinion. I now solemnly ask, Is it probable that a text which admits of so many in-

* Trumpet, No. 34, Vol. 13, last p.

terpretations, proves the future salvation of all men, when it does not even mention that doctrine: Reason and common sense, so often appealed to by universalists, answer NO.

4. When it is made evident that the phrase, 'all the seed of Israel,' (verse 25,) means every individual of the human race, universalism will be established by this text. But as this cannot be done, I need not say that it has no such meaning.

5. If this verse refers to the immortal state, it proves that God's enemies shall be ashamed there! This surely does not look much like universal salvation. "To him shall men come; and ALL that are incensed against him shall be ASHAMED," says the text. This part of the verse affords much more proof that ALL who hate God will be punished in the world of spirits, than the first part of it does that all mankind will be finally made holy and happy.

6. 'Paul is the best commentator on Isaiah.' In Rom. 14:11, he quotes this passage from Isaiah, and applies it to the judgment. 'For as it is written, [in Isa. 45:23,] As I live saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.' He then adds, 'So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.' Verse 12. This is Paul's view of the text. But universalists give it another, a much more liberal, meaning,—'So then every one of Adam's posterity shall be saved.' Thus it is seen that Paul and our opponents are at issue on this point! This, however, should not cause much wonder.

The preceding arguments show that all the commentators in Christendom, reason and common sense, the *Manuscripts* and *Versions*, the apostle, and their own reasoning, are all against the views of universalists on the passage before us. Whether they will set the text 'down as obsolete,' or continue to quote it in support of their belief, in direct opposition to Paul's application of it, remains to be seen.

ELIAS HUTCHINS.

ERRATA.

In the note, P. 2, 5th line from the bottom, for *minny*, read 'nunny.' P. 8, 21st line from the bottom, blot *neither*; 14th line, for *last*, read 'second.' P. 18, line 14 from the top, for *was*, read 'were.' P. 24, line 9th from the bottom, for *was*, read 'were;' for *he is*, read 'they are.' P. 25, line 5th from the top, for *provet his*, read 'prove this.' P. 27, line 16th from the top, for *admit*, read 'omit.' Pp. 35, 36, where *Toroaster* occurs, read 'Zoronster.' P. 48, line 4th from the bottom, blot *to be*. P. 57, 2d line from the top, for *the dead*, read 'all the literally dead.' P. 58, top line, for *sinners*, read 'heathens.'





